THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION

Volume XI NOVEMBER 1925 Number 4

THE NATURAL PROCEDURE IN ARGUMENT

GLADYS MURPHY GRAHAM
University of California

IN the study *Logic and Argumentation* (November 1924 issue of the JOURNAL) certain criticisms of argumentation were set down. Two points of attack on the traditional, in-a-line, debate brief type of argument were stressed: (1) a lack of realization of its actual thought basis and thus mechanical treatment of a thought process with much resultant inaccuracy, and (2) the possession by it of a monopolistic place where partnership of methods, evaluated juxtaposition of the old and certain new types of approach and reasoning, is the need. The lines of development advocated, of necessity very generally, were, then, internal reform of what we now have and the addition of new features.

Leaving the internal reform aside for the time being, it is in relation to that second phase and need that the present study has been made. It seeks to treat, as fully as limited space will allow, what might be called a new type of argument,[1] one as yet unde-

[1]The claim of newness is here made with fingers crossed, as it were! For it, for the time being, "King's X" is asked. It happens that since the "new" or "alternate" method of argument and reasoning under consideration was first suggested valuable and highly valued discussion and criticism has come from Mr. Wichelns in his article "Analysis and Synthesis in Argumentation" and from Mr. Immel in conversation. By both the important question of newness, of whether or not argumentation does have, in another form, the thing being suggested, has been raised. That

veloped on its scientific side as far as argumentation is concerned. The logician who gave its principles to the philosophical world in their most complete form[2] has called it "the natural procedure in argument." For the sake of clarity treatment of it here will be in relation to (1) general nature of method of development, (2) values, (3) underlying principles and technique, construction and tests for validity.

A certain critic, reviewing a modern play, heads his paragraph "The Triumph of the Inevitable" and writes:

"The director does not seem to tell the story. He seems to follow respectfully in the path of its unfolding. It is as simple and direct and

question must be met and seriously considered—it brings directly to the fore interesting and vital matters concerning a present lacuna in the science of argument—but it has seemed best to defer such consideration until after the straight presentation of the "natural procedure" argument on its own merits. In short, the desire is to first present, as clearly as is possible in a necessarily brief discussion, the constructive case, then to take a moment or two at the end to consider it in relation to the questions raised. Certainly this "new" type of argument is somehow related to what Mr. Wichelns has termed "the rhetorical plan of a speech" (this JOURNAL, June, 1925, p. 268); it may come close in certain phases of its practice to the kind of argument Mr. Stone and many others have advocated, for which the brief is not a guide, though still retained as a preliminary test of the student's own thinking (this JOURNAL, Vol. IV, p. 269). This "new" type, then, may be found to be a possible plan of one or all of these with a certain variation and, I believe, a vital *plus*. But first for a straight consideration of it as such.

[2]It is in the work of the late Bernard Bosanquet that the basic principles underlying the natural procedure in argument are to be found. The fundamental conception from which it builds, that of system as the determining condition of inference, is the cardinal one of his *Logic*, a little more clearly, certainly more simply put in his later works *Essentials of Logic* and, outstandingly, *Implication and Linear Inference*. The aim of this study is to seek to bring over and adapt the basic principles of the Bosanquetian logic to the field and work of argumentation. That it gives the thought basis of a vital type of argument is undoubtedly true; the difficulty has been that it, as given, is buried rather deeply in abstract philosophical concept. Bosanquet's outstanding interest in his method was in relation to the total "system of reality;" our task is to apply the same method to specific, particularized complexes and their systematic relationship. The application has at times been carried further than the work of Bosanquet would give detailed and concrete justification for, but it is believed that the expansion is a logical working out of his principles, an enlargement in application that is implied in the theory.

compelling as life itself. It has the inevitable progress of the old Greek drama."

Change the first sentence a little to read: "The speaker does not seem to force the argument," then go on, "He seems to follow in the path of its unfolding. It is . . . direct and *compelling*. It has . . . *inevitable* progress." Reading thus one gets something, much indeed, of the general method of what we call the *systematic argument* and of the end which it desires. Its plan is simply to portray a situation which gradually, of itself, without compulsion or contention on the part of the speaker, through the compelling power of a developing situation makes evident to the mind of the hearer the necessity of one certain solution. The method is not in the orthodox and generally accepted sense argumentative; rather it is that of exposition with a goodly dash of narration and description. Technically it does not argue; it merely sets forth—yet slowly, definitely as it proceeds, the lines of descriptive development begin to converge and it becomes compellingly evident to each thinking mind that such a set of conditions implies, necessitates, one thing, the conclusion toward which an approach has been, from the beginning, being made. It is argument in a very true sense, its aim is to convince and persuade, yet it is argument of which exposition, narration and description are handmaidens.

To briefly illustrate movement and general method, first as seen in a powerful piece of argument which of necessity worked from background: Probably the most noted British authority on Russia was to speak to an American audience concerning the Russion Revolution at a time when the stir over the vicious character of Bolshevism carried with it the belief that the revolution was simply a precipitate and unwarranted uprising of a vicious lower class and a thing for which that lower class was wholly responsible. The speaker wished to prove that such was in no way the case. His proposition to be established was, baldly put, "The revolutionary group in Russia was not responsible for the revolution. The upper classes, not the revolting lower class, were the real causal factors." Given his desire and the state of mind of the audience, what was his method of development to be? By no means that prescribed by brief structure, statement of proposition, the enumeration of the contentions and antagonizing points to be established and their subsequent superimposed proof. Instead he began far

away from the revolution with a selective, rapidly moving story-picture—Russia with its physical conditions, the nature of its people, its crushing autocracy, its oppressions; Russia in the war and the unnecessary slaughter, the crippled rising from the field of the dead and going back to say that they had gone up like sheep, unarmed, a mass of humanity hurled against machine guns. It was not emotionally done; it was simply fact piled upon fact, picture put up beside picture, until the very pressure of it demanded the conclusion. *The situation being what it was,* one thing *must* come. The speaker's conclusion, which at the beginning would have been foreign to the audience, hostilely received, was at the close but the result of its own thinking. It fairly rushed ahead of him to it. Because it had accepted the non-contentious background situation, it must accept the conclusion which that situation implied. According to formal designation the work was not argument—and yet how powerfully the speaker had argued and won his point.

In a most unusual debate on the League of Nations the same type of development was used by a speaker upholding the League and addressing an audience realized to be hostile. With a consciousness and command of his method, he turned the thought of the group, not initially to the League at all, but to a factual and descriptive portrayal of world conditions at the time; the economic, the financial, the psychological, the military situation were simply shown. The audience was interested, it thought with the speaker. And gradually the lines of development converged; that seen situation required a definite thing and, having accepted the situation, the mind could not consistently refuse the move implied.

So much for the moment for briefly noted illustrations given simply to make initially clear the lines of general development. Consider now, in relation to those noted lines of development, the concrete statement of method given by Bosanquet as he treats a type of argument which finds its basis in *implication,* in reasoning from a given situation to its necessitated, its implied part. He writes:

"When a barrister opens his case, or a theorist introduces us, in his initial statement, to the basis of his doctrine . . . an exposition is set before us which at first sight reads more like a description than an argument and it is only as we enter further into the proposed construction that we observe it to be in fact the development of a subject *intended to intro-*

duce us to a scheme of consequences which, if we accept the initial description, we shall be unable to deny."[3]

Such is, according to Bosanquet, the natural procedure in argument, the natural method of opening a case. It is certainly the one used in the instance noted above. Yet it stands as a definite departure from strict argument technique as set down in the texts of the profession; it differs widely from the linear inference method of development found in the brief. It is necessary, then, to ask, before we pass to the rather difficult but keenly interesting matter of basic principles and technique, just what are its outstanding values.

Probably the first of such values arises from the fact that the method approaches conviction by means of a psychologically well-grounded, ounce-of-prevention type of persuasion. It is a mere platitude that a man cannot be forced to a desired response. Convinced against his will he remains "of the same opinion still" today as when the maxim was first stated. This is realized, but combined with the fact that there is in human nature in general a very distinct tendency toward what one psychologist has well called "the contrarient idea,"[4] that is, a contrary reaction directly against baldly controversial argument superimposed, and you have the distinct problem which argument must face. It is our task here merely to note that the systematic argument solves that problem by superimposing no controversial points at all. And such is in reality the normal procedure, in a search for truth, is it not? The speaker has reached his conclusion through a noting and evaluation of fact; he has probably come to it as a development out of a situation observed.[5] Perhaps he himself would have reacted adversely to it

[3] Bosanquet, B., *Implication and Linear Inference*, p. 105. Italics are mine.

[4] MacPherson, William, *The Psychology of Persuasion*, p. 161.

[5] Graham Wallas, in his work on psychology as related to politics *(Human Nature in Politics)* gives interesting testimony, backed by analysis, as to the naturalness of such a method of approach to a conclusion when formed by the individual mind, that is, the normalcy of the development method in the process of forming one's own opinions, thus in preparation for an argument. He notes from the biography of Gladstone how that statesman seems to have reached his conclusions through a consideration of the surrounding situation in all its phases. But having shown this as an illustration of the way in which the individual mind

had it been dropped upon him without preliminary study—out of the blue. His plan, then, might well be to direct the mind of the audience along the course which he has followed so that, through noting certain of the facts which have led him to his conclusion, it may *through its own thinking*[6] arrive at the same end. Its task will of course have been greatly facilitated by his work. He has gone through a mass of irrelevant material and material superfluous though relevant. All that he has cut away in preliminary work and in relation to certain definite and concrete standards; now he can set before the audience the clear view of the situation. He is not forcing, contending, compelling; he is directing the mind that it may form its own conclusion, make its own inferences, to which it is compelled only by the logic of observed facts.[7] There is left no place for the contrarient idea; the conclusion is only reached when the mind of the audience is prepared for it by its own thinking just as the mind of the speaker may be assumed to have been.

Consider for a moment the value of such an approach for the work on the Russian revolution previously noted. It was a highly exaggerated case of the probability of the contrarient idea. The audience was frankly hostile. Had the speaker thrown down at the outset the gage of battle of his conclusion along with a list of definitely controversial points to be established, had he done it

may, and in fact does, operate, the writer goes on to note that when Gladstone got into "full-dress debate" . . . . "his Eton and Oxford training in words always contended with his experience of things" (cf. pp. 149-166, *passim*) and it was the type of speech with straight deductive reasoning as its basis, the debate brief type, which was given. In short, the natural method of constructive thought, because it conflicted with the scholastic rules of speech set down, could not find expression in its normal form; it must be crushed into the mold prescribed by the orthodoxy.

[6] MacPherson, in discussing the psychology of advertising, stresses the persuasive value of having the suggestion made to a prospective buyer seem "to proceed entirely from himself" since "he is therefore more likely . . . . to act upon it" (*Psychology of Persuasion*, p. 161). It is from this same psychologically grounded realization of human tendencies that the public speaker may work.

[7] Professor Woolbert writes: "Make it impossible for a hearer to mistake what is meant and how one idea leads to another, and the matter of inference takes care of itself; for man is an inferring machine." ("The Place of Logic in a System of Persuasion," this JOURNAL, Vol. IV, p. 34).

even after a pleasing detachable introduction or "History of the Question," an almost impenetrable wall of contrary belief would have arisen between him and his audience. It would have listened politely with its ears but its mind would have given back only unbelief based on prejudice and preconceived opinion. Yet with a different type of reasoning the speaker convinced his audience; he won as I have rarely seen a man win against odds.

The same situation faced the speaker on the League to whose work reference was made. A case of very great likelihood of the contrarient idea—the problem solved by directing the thought of the audience through fact to conclusion, by a natural rather than a forced procedure. It is this psychological normalcy of its approach to conviction which gives to the systematic argument much of its outstanding power. Because of this it is peculiarly adapted for use with a hostile audience. Its object is constantly conviction, its method of approach persuasive in the best sense of the term.

A second value of the method can only be touched upon lightly that of stress upon reasoning from a *whole* situation. The temptation under the method of setting up a proposition as conclusion and listing points of proof under it is to merely argue *at* a proposition. By mutual consent the pros tell all the obviously good things concerning a proposed move, the cons all the bad, yet it is more than probable that only out of the interaction, the evaluation and weighing of the two, will arise a realization of its real value or lack of it. Take, for example, the arguments of a few years ago on Irish independence. The subject is used for illustrative purposes because it is well known and so many published debates on it are easily available. Run over them in half a dozen compilations. In practically all the Affirmative argued that:

> **Ireland should be granted independence, for**
> **Ireland is ethnically a nation.**
> **Ireland is economically capable of self-support, etc., etc.**

Proximity to England, danger to Empire, etc., were left totally out of consideration in Affirmative calculations, being Negative arguments. This in the straight brief form arguments; under the systematic argument plan there would and must be reasoning from and in relation to the whole situation involving evaluative consideration of the character and needs of Ireland, plus the position of

and dangers to England, plus world opinion and world demands, etc.—it is out of such elements taken together and seen as an implying whole that a conclusion can be read, a conclusion given plausibility by the fact that it is observed as the necessity of a fully realized situation. Graham Wallas, referring to the need of "the *quantitative* method of reasoning" states, "No estimate of the result of any act can be accurate unless all its conditions and their relative importance are taken into account."[8] It is as a whole that a situation necessitates or invalidates a given conclusion;[9] it is out of the noted interaction of obviously Negative and Affirmative arguments that compelling proof grows.

But a question arises: we have noted the necessity of wholeness of a complex considered, yet it must be portrayed in a short argument and a mass of material clings to any situation. How can one ever secure completeness? Time would not permit and if it did, the result would be a long and boring speech. And yet it can be done because *the true whole is not that easy and mechanical thing which is simply an accumulation of all there is.* Such is nothing more than a heap. "The whole," Bosanquet writes, "is not merely all we have but satisfies our intelligence by definite necessity."[10] "Completeness," as Dewey has phrased a thought related here, "is not exhaustiveness per se but adequacy as respects means and its end."[11] The whole for the sculptor is not the great uncut block of marble—that is the mass of raw material; the true whole is the finished statue which is the result of chipping away all that is not absolutely vital to the portrayal. The genuine whole for the systematic argument is the minimum which will show the necessity of the conclusion demanded and no other.

[8] Wallas, Graham, *op. cit.*, p. 149.

[9] Mr. Wichelns raises a point pertinent here (this JOURNAL, Vol. XI, p. 269) in stressing the fact that "Students neglect the whole economic situation with which they are dealing . . . . because they do not understand it." This is undoubtedly true, students do neglect the total situation because of a lack of understanding of it, but may it not be that one reason why they understand it so little is exactly because the argumentation theory of the present gives so little realization of a need for such an understanding, because it makes no constructive use of the total situation and gives no technique for its testing?

[10] Bosanquet, B. *op. cit.*, p. 19.

[11] Dewey, John, *Essays in Experimental Logic*, p. 343.

But such a statement takes us directly to the matter of basic principles and technique. On what basis can any whole be said to truly necessitate a new part, a conclusion? Just how may one construct and test the type of argument we have seen in its general outlines? It is this that argumentation must ask if it is to get beyond the stage of groping trial and error methods: underlying the art must be the definite rules and vital concepts of the science.

First it must be noted that the foundation principle of the method under discussion is the conception of a true whole as a *system,* a construction in which things not only *are* but *belong* together, in which, given certain parts, others can be read off from them. Just as, when all the parts of a puzzle save one have been fitted together, the exact shape and size of the remaining part are predetermined; just as the final stone in an arch can be of but one character to make the whole complete, so situations form systems, wholes in which the parts have the characteristic of *pointing beyond themselves,* of implying a new factor. Consider for a moment the work of the astronomer who predicts that in a certain place at a certain time a new heavenly body will appear. It is not wizard's magic, it is a reading off from the nature of the system of the heavens a necessary thing implied in the given parts and relationships. These have pointed beyond themselves. Bosanquet writes of a system that "The content has a nature which is capable of prescribing its own continuation."[12] Having shown a systematic situation, then, it can be held that "Given this, there must be that."

It is exactly because this is true, because of the pointing beyond itself, the continuation-prescribing nature of the content of a system that President Wilson could argue in 1917 in his war message that, *the situation being what it was* "America . . . can do no other." (Was it not this that we really meant in 1917 when we said that war was "inevitable"?) It is exactly because of the fact of systematic relationship that the British speaker could show or at least seem to show that the system formed by Russian conditions predetermined the Revolution as truly as the system of the heavens predetermined the appearance of the new planet. Upon a realization of such belonging-togetherness[13] the

[12] Bosanquet, B., *The Essentials of Logic,* pp. 139-40.

[13] It is to be clearly understood that this belonging-togetherness, this systematic relationship, is a characteristic of the material itself. Realis-

systematic argument is based; in it it finds the necessity of its conclusions. Accepting the systematic situation non-contentiously portrayed, the mind must accept its implied part or, turning back upon itself, deny that content which was previously accepted. It is this necessity which finds expression in the vital formula "This or Nothing"—accept *this*, the conclusion prepared for and seen to be implied, or *nothing*, the denial of the necessitating complex.

ing that it is there, the student seeks it, by inference reads it off. Professor Alexander has written concerning "the methods of inference which science uses and logic describes": "They are our methods but they are dictated by nature herself. The secrets which they reveal are not inventions of ours but disclosures, which have their correspondence in reality itself. In science we are in this position: it is as if nature, or the limited topic of the special science, were itself a great work of art, and we, the investigators, are like the art critics who reveal the secrets of the work." (S. Alexander, *The Hibbert Journal*, January, 1925). But, the question has been raised, would not the implicational method of development in argument, then, eliminate the possibility of an affirmative and a negative side? If the implications are there and are read off, is there room for question concerning them? We noted that the speaker dealing with the Russian Revolution *seemed* to show its necessity as truly as the astronomers read off the appearance of the new planet; yet the laws governing the nature of any system which involves human complexes are by no means as well known as are those of the physical world. The great work of art with its secrets is there in both cases, but we are far less able to see, to reveal them, in the latter. It is this fact which will give two sidedness to the argument on almost any political or economic question, any question we term debatable, despite the method of proof used. It is realized that on many questions we cannot, at the present stage of enlightenment, hope to reach ultimate and unassailable truth by any type of reasoning: when we can in relation to any question it immediately passes out of the class of debatable things. But for attempted proof of the large class of debatable questions there are more and less convincing methods of development, methods of reasoning which vary in the likelihood of validity of their results. The systematic, developmental approach will rarely lead to a reading of the situation so perfect that there will be no "other side" to the question though its aim will be to make that "other side" *seem* impossible, lend the greatest plausibility to its own case. This is the aim in any argument: the point being made in this study is that there is the greatest likelihood of its realization when the systematic approach is used, the greatest likelihood because it most directly seeks the actual truth attempting simply to read out of a situation the implications which *are there*.

"If the . . . system has been rightly read . . . *you can only annul the implication by ceasing to affirm the system.*"[14]

The "This or Nothing", then, is the expression of the final choice which confronts the audience. As such, it is of the utmost importance for its validity becomes the prime test of whether or not the system "has been properly read." If the "This or Nothing" truly represents the only possibility of choice—accept the conclusion or deny the whole situation portrayed—then the argument of which it is the culmination stands as valid. When, guided by a realization of end and method, the argument has been tentatively constructed, it must be more specifically tested and tested first by the validity of the "This or Nothing" choice which it prescribes. It is necessary, then, to consider the "This or Nothing" a little in detail.

Logically the "This or Nothing" is a *disjunction*,[15] that is, it is a statement which offers such a choice between possibilities that by accepting one, the other or others, are eliminated; by elimination of all save one, that remaining one must hold true. We say "The book is *either* in this room *or* at the office." Finding that it is not in the room, it becomes evident that, if the statement is valid, it must be at the office. But it is obvious that for validity in such reasoning one thing must be true of the disjunction—*it must initially have enumerated all the possibilities.* If the book in question may be *either* in this room *or* at the office *or* upstairs, then the fact that it is not in the room proves nothing in regard to its being at the office. In the same way, if the choice which the audience really has is this, the presented conclusion—or this, some other conclusion which may be said to be implied in the situation —or nothing, then the denial of the given conclusion will not force

[14] Bosanquet, B., *Implication and Linear Inference*, p. 11. Italics are mine.

[15] A simple treatment of the nature and requirements of disjunctive reasoning can be found in any elementary logic text, as Creighton, *An Introductory Logic*, pp. 54-156, or Cunningham, *Textbook of Logic*, pp. 151-153. For a more advanced and finer treatment, see Joseph, H. W. B., *An Introduction to Logic*. Of particular importance here is the conception of the disjunction as "of knowledge," of true disjunction as a possibility only in a comparatively late stage of research, thought and preparation. Joseph well treats "The Disjunction of Knowledge," Creighton touches on it.

the unpleasant choice of the nothing at all and the force of the argument is lost.

It was to guard against just a possibility that Woodrow Wilson in his war message did an interesting thing. He had set forth a situation which, he believed, necessitated *one specific thing*—war, yet he knew that there were those who would contend that it demanded, or at least allowed, another solution. And so, to forestall such contentions, he deliberately held up against his situation the two pseudo-possibilities, armed neutrality and submission, and showed each in turn to be out of harmony with, not implied in, the existing situation. The first past experience had proved to be a failure, the other was shown to be at variance with the nature of America. Thus he sought to forestall the attack upon his argument at its most vulnerable point and definitely prepared for his conclusion as the *only* way of meeting the situation. It was this—war—or a denial of the whole situation as it had been shown. No other possibility existed.

Again in his League of Nations speech the President's conclusion was a clear statement of the impossibility of an alternate solution: "The light shines on the path ahead, *and nowhere else.*" But this time there had been insufficient preliminary guarding against other possibilities and it is interesting to note that the most telling attack on that argument was in relation to the "*and nowhere else,*" was upon the validity of the underlying "This or Nothing" disjunction. The President had sought to show that the situation allowed but one thing—one must, then, accept that or deny the system. But a large group in the Senate said, "We need do nothing of the sort; we realize world conditions today and we accept your portrayal of them but we hold that they imply something different, not the League of the Versailles Treaty but *some other League.*" Basically the contention, if it had found technical expression, would have been, "We are not limited by the 'This—or Nothing' which does not enumerate all possibilities; the choice is this, your League—*or this,* some other League—or the denial of the situation, and in such case the refusal of the presented conclusion in itself assures no evil results."

In its security, then, against another member in that final and vital "This or Nothing" choice is the measure of the logical strength or weakness of the systematic argument. It is that test

to which the argument as constructed must be submitted. If the background situation as the speaker has planned to present it seems to allow a conclusion other than his own, there must be a tightening, perhaps, certainly a particularization to rule out the possibility. Elements previously omitted may in the testing be shown to be vital, elements included may be seen as unnecessary to the clear development of the system. At times, when the danger of an alternate suggestion seems distinctly imminent, it may be well to specifically refute it in advance, to initially show it out of harmony, as Wilson did in his war message. Throughout it must be borne in mind that only the whole which appears to necessitate one and only one conclusion forms the content of convincing systematic argument.

Thus must the constructed argument be tested by the possibility of another conclusion. But even when it is found to portray a true system, there is still another criterion. The desire is to make necessary a choice between a given conclusion and a denial of a situation shown to exist. When that choice has been as far as possible insured against other alternatives by the validity of the "This or Nothing" much has been done, yet there remains the necessity of making sure that the wrong choice as between these two will not be made. If the audience denies the system in preference to accepting its implied conclusion, the case is lost. Now, of course, when the situation portrayed deals solely with concrete facts and the facts are truly portrayed, there is no rational possibility of such a choice and little probability of an irrational acceptance of it.[16] Given such a concrete situation, its vital factors so noted that it inevitably and naturally leads to one and only one conclusion, the result is absolute necessity in reasoning. Such is conceived to have been the character of the previously noted work on the Russian Revolution.

But there are cases, many of them, where a vital part of the portrayed situation is not concrete fact, but is what is conceived to be a matter of honor or of a duty which may be rejected if the thing implied is too displeasing, if its cost is held to be too great.

[16] For brief treatment of psychological inhibitions to the contradiction of a judgment made, see Bosanquet, *The Essentials of Logic*, p. 26. For the mind to contradict a series of relationships perceived is a serious matter.

So in Wilson's speech on the League a large factor in the necessitating system was of this type—America's honor would not permit her to desert Europe—and it was on the basis of acceptance of the Nothing, repudiation of the system or a necessary part of it, that the attack of the "Irreconcilables" was made. They did not say with the other opposing group, "With you we realize Europe's need, our obligation to her, our honor necessitating participation with her, but we have a way different from yours which is the thing the situation really demands." Thus they did not attack the validity of the "This or Nothing" conclusion: rather they said, "Away with the whole conception of American responsibility in Europe; we repudiate it all rather than accept the dangerous thing it implies." The choice was acknowledged and the acceptance was of the Nothing. For argument which must be not only valid but effective, such an exigency is to be guarded against. So it may be said of the second test that the acceptance of the Nothing should be either factually impossible or psychologically as improbable as it is capable of being made—preferably both. The necessitating situation as presented must be true to facts and its denial must be more distasteful to the receiving group than the acceptance of the implied conclusion could be. But there is no great likelihood that this will fail to be the case. As we have noted, the very method of approach of the systematic argument, by guarding against the probability of antagonism, reduces to a minimum the likelihood of a desire to deny the system. It is only necessary here to call passing attention to the fact that there may be a residuary possibility of the acceptance of the Nothing which should be kept in mind, against which the speaker should guard.

Does it stand out in any way clearly in outline form, this method of arument which finds its life in, and takes its departure from, an initially non-contentiously portrayed situation which, because of the systematic character of a true whole, may, as the lines of expository and descriptive development gradually converge, be seen to necessitate one and only one thing as its continuing factor? Out of that basic characteristic of a system—that its content prescribes its own continuation—arises the logical necessity of one conclusion or of denial of the situation that implies it. So there comes the "This or Nothing" choice by which the argument is tested: that two-member disjunction must give

all the possibilities of choice and the likelihood of the acceptance of its Nothing must be reduced to the minimum from both a factual and a psychological point of view.[17]

Such is the "natural procedure." Is it, then, a new method in argument? In relation to a groping practice, no, save as it seeks to give it conscious form and so controlability; as scientific argument, yes. Review with me rapidly the present situation in argumentation: our science is confined to the brief form as a mold for testing the thought of an argument. Few, if any, authorities entirely omit it from the preparation of any argument. However much the final product desired may vary, as long as it remains argument it seems that it must at a certain stage in its preparation be compressed into the mold of the brief. Yet there has been widespread recognition throughout the profession of the fact that the material as it comes out of the brief mold is not suited to the presentation needs of all occasions. Professor O'Neill and many others have pointed out that its straight conclusion-proof develop-

[17] It may be well to note specifically that the type of argument we have been considering, the constructive systematic argument, deals in each case with *completed inevitability*; the portrayal is always of a past and immediately present situation now necessitating a new move. Of Bosanquet's attitude toward the war Mrs. Bosanquet writes: "He was convinced that . . . . *when the crisis came*, England had no choice but to act as she did." But she goes on to say, "*he steadily refused to admit that we had no responsibility in the matter.*" (Bosanquet, Helen, *Bernard Bosanquet: A Short Account of His Life*, pp. 133-136). The point is that the completed inevitability of a given time is a construction of a past time. In 1914 for England war was "inevitable," but in 1909, 1910, 1913 statesman could have looked ahead, seen the trend of development, and broken it by refusing the acts which must, if committed, form a part of a system which, in time, would necessitate war. There is, then, at a given time, completed inevitability but there is also, constantly, inevitability in the making. This fact has its implications for reasoning and for argument as well as for ethics and politics. In negative or rebuttal work an act or plan may be tellingly opposed by showing it to be a phase of a development which, in time, must necessitate an unpleasant thing. Austen Chamberlain argued against excessive armament a few months ago at Geneva on exactly such grounds. The purpose here is simply to refer to this phase of the systematic argument which it has been impossible to consider in the foregoing study. It is one worthy of attention and scientific development. Basically it depends upon implicational reasoning; it is a rebuttal argument corollary of the constructive systematic argument as here treated.

ment is distinctly unsuited for delivery before a hostile audience; it is noted, as for example in G. K. Pattee's *Practical Argumentation*,[18] that successful salesmanship avoids its method. The fact is it rides roughshod over much that we know of the psychology of persuasion. We have, then, one narrow form for testing argument, faced by the fact that it is unsuited to a large sector of the practical delivery need.

What has been suggested as a way out of the difficulty? As was noted in another context,[19] the History of the Question is at times relied on as a detachable preliminary capable of breaking the shock of direct and immediate contact with dogmatically superimposed conclusion and contentiously presented proof. But there has been another and a more important development. The brief is retained but as itself a preliminary to argument, not a plan for it as finally presented. In an article published in the JOURNAL a few years ago one finds as the direct answer to the question "Shall the student, then, be taught to make briefs?": "Yes, but he should make them in order to test his own thinking, and not use them as outline guides to his argument." Running over the files of the JOURNAL, one comes upon other expressions of a similar conception of the place and function of the brief. Mr. Stone speaks of advising pupils "having made their briefs to throw them away when they begin to write their argument" and asks, "Why not tell the student that the brief has served its purpose when he has made it, that it is merely a test for his own thinking and not a guide for his argument?"[20] But it is in Mr. Wicheln's recent article, *Analysis and Synthesis in Argumentation*, that one finds the most clear-cut statement of the present condition. There a definite distinction is drawn between the *brief* and "the rhetorical plan of a speech," which "is not necessarily that of the brief."

It seems, then, that there exists a definite dualism. We have the brief, the form into which the elements of reasoning and argument must be put; we put them in but we find that for certain types of occasions, the argument thus formed is not suitable. We must then take the material out of the brief mold again and construct from it a different type of thing according to something that

[18] Pp. 112-113.

[19] This JOURNAL, Volume X, p. 363.

[20] This *Journal*, Volume IV, p. 260.

is rhetorical plan. But just what is the scientific basis of the rhetorical plan speech? Into what *form* is the student to put his material after he has taken it out of that of the brief? He is told the ends sought—attention, persuasion—but not with any scientific accuracy the means which must be used.

I have found little or nothing of concrete methodology in relation to the construction of the post-brief yet non-brief argument. It seems to be a rather indefinite thing in somewhat the stage of alchemy and Black Magic before the sciences of chemistry and medicine were put under and behind them—unless one can assume that it is somehow still based on the brief with its form in some way still determined by it. It seems to be this that Mr. Wichelns has in mind for, in speaking of the rhetorical plan of a speech, he calls attention to the fact that, "the order of arguments in a brief may be shifted in actual delivery?" This is, of course, true but would the reordering of briefed arguments—elements themselves made up of conclusions backed up by linear inference proof—account for, give guidance in relation to, or make possible the specialized development of Wilson's war message of his League of Nations speech, or of the Russian Revolution argument and others cited? Professor O'Neill, in discussing the possible functions of the brief in relation to presentation, says: "The brief may be but the foundation stones and beams which sustain *and shape* the building . . . or it may be but an *orderly* storehouse of material from which to draw whatever is needed for specific occasions."[21] In the first case we would have delivered the straight clothed brief, the linear form exactly as the brief "shaped" it; in the second instance there would *still be brief form* but with parts of the outlined argument omitted, as Professor O'Neill points out, others given in different order according to the needs of the occasion. Adaptation, then, would consist in selection of parts of the briefed material. But could such a drawing from an *orderly* storehouse of brief mold arguments possibly give the type of case we have been considering, the developmental approach to a conclusion through the portrayal of a situation which itself implies a new move, the type which we have seen to be the best fitted to the meeting of a hostile, indeed of any, audience, the best "rhetorical plan?" The method of approach, the whole development, the use

[21] *Public Speaking*, pp. 250-251. Italics are mine.

of exposition and narration—it is all so utterly different from straight linear treatment. Raising the least possible question, why would one put material into the storehouse of the brief when it would then be in a totally different shape and order from that in which one wanted to take it out again? To put the question perfectly clearly, why brief argument as a preliminary to a non-brief presentation of it? Why would a person cast all material in a square mold when in some cases the finished product desired was a spherical object—unless, perchance, there existed no round molds?

The present study has attempted to give a non-brief mold[22] for the class of arguments which require non-brief presentation. The element of newness has been stressed, not because newness has the slightest virtue of itself, but for the sake of emphasizing the fact that implicational argument cannot be superimposed upon the traditional brief. At best such an attempt means duplication of effort, a valueless preliminary forming in a mold in which the material is not to be delivered. But it means more than that—what this complete reliance on the brief has done is to doom the construction of the speech-argument which is to be presented to a vague, non-logical development for which there have been no laws or tests. It is in the brief, it has been assumed, that we make our bow to logic, to strict conviction; then, that obligation fulfilled, we strike out into the non-logical, into forming for persuasion. It is this assumption which is basically at fault. Thought, reason, reasoned argument, are not things of one rigid form with extra-logical alteration to meet new needs. "Thought," Lodge has put it, "cannot be restricted to the use of any single group of models, but is as various and complex as it finds advisable in dealing with

[22] For strict accuracy "non-brief" here and in the line following should read "non-linear brief," but throughout this study, to avoid confusion and make the issue clear-cut, brief has been used as synonymous with the traditional linear brief, the only form of outline now designated by that term. But Professor O'Neill interestingly speaks of "a complete brief—*a full statement of the intellectual basis of the case.*" (*Ibid.*, p. 251). Under this excellent broad definition there may well be, not an absence of the brief in cases of systematic argument, but a new type of brief, for thought in the implicational mold can have a species of outline in which may be set down, for the sake of clearness of view and ease of testing, "a full statement of the intellectual basis of the case." We can, then, come to have the *implicational brief*, standing by the side of the *linear inference brief* of traditional argumentation.

the problems which arise." It is a non-linear thought model, a non-linear brief argument model, that I have attempted to show. It is not one previously unused in argument; rather it is the natural procedure, but gropingly used because of lack of realization of the fact that it possesses its own law and logic, its own perfectly scientific structural requirements and tests. It has been given to meet what is believed to be an outstanding problem of argumentation today, that of the strange dualism which has arisen out of the breadth of the necessities of practice superimposed upon the narrowness of a static conception of logic and possible argumentative form; a dualism which has resulted in the testing of argument in a form in which it is not to be delivered, and the delivery of argument in a form for which there have been no adequate tests.

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE VOICE TEACHER*

AS SEEN BY THE OTOLARYNGOLOGIST

T. J. WILLIAMS
Chicago

AT considerable inconvenience and expense you have gathered here today actuated by the desire to become more proficient in your profession. When honored by your invitation to address you, I felt rather reluctant because I was not certain that I could present to you anything that would be of much practical value. However, your representative insisted that you would be interested in any aspect of voice teaching observed by a laryngologist and, on his kind insistence, I finally promised to attempt to give you a few ideas that we have found in our work as otolaryngologists, especially in that work we have done in connection with those of your profession who train and develop the human voice.

No attempt will be made to be dogmatic nor enter into discussions about controversial subjects long in dispute. Rather will we attempt to put our humble knowledge before you in the simplest manner and language and, insofar as possible, confine ourselves to fundamentals.

As a profession, you undertake to develop the human voice to

*Read at the Evanston Convention, December 30, 1924.

attain a certain end. This end is to convey the impressions, emotions, thoughts and knowledge of one individual to another through the medium of the voice, together with gestures, facial expressions and such other means as your student already possesses, combined with those you can develop. All of these contribute to the final product of your efforts. Here we shall consider only the ordinary methods concerned with the voice and its production and that which is unquestionably within the realm of those of us who specialize in the ear, nose and throat.

The finest toned Stradivarius was once a crude log, only a piece of lumber, from which a skilled craftsman whittled an exquisitely toned violin. But that rough timber had to have within it inherent qualities that would produce just such a violin. Because of this, the craftsman spent much time in its choice, determining not only the kind of wood, but, in what country in grew,—whether it grew in the sheltered valley or on the exposed mountain where winds blew bending the tree and thereby influencing the flexibility of its fibre, its resiliency and the quality of its tone. The finest piece of sculpture was once an ugly jagged piece of rock. Before he began working on it, the sculpturing genius looked well into its geological classification, into the stratum of rock from which it came, its graining, its strength, its endurance, its polish, its coloring and its resistance to the chisel. He gave all these points thoughtful consideration before beginning his laborious efforts, determining that the crude material possessed the qualites necessary for the expression of his ideas in a sculptured heritage to mankind. The same thought applies to a wonderful and marvelous piece of machinery, be it an exquisite wrist watch, the majestic mountain-climbing locomotive, the heaven-searching lens of the telescope or the secret-revealing powerful microscope. In fact, everywhere in the field of human accomplishments where the rough, the uncouth, and the crude are converted into the refined, the beautiful and the exquisite, we find it imperative to give careful heed to the fundamental qualities of the original material.

In no profession is the scrutinizing and appraising of the raw material more essential than in the choice of students from whom you may choose to develop to that wonderful degree of perfection your abilities make only the greater by your self evasive modesty. Too infrequently, indeed, does the public look beyond the orator,

the actor, or the singer to see the wearied instructor who labored long and patiently in developing the artist who now holds the audience enthralled by the fine form of human expression you teach your students.

Sometimes, we must admit, as we listen to some students' vocal efforts, a feeling comes over us that their instructors either forgot or entirely ignored the biblical admoniton that referred to silken purses and the ears of swine.

Realizing then, the importance of your choice of material on which you will expend your labor, we shall endeavor to assist you by our humble studies and experiences. Before going further, this is about as opportune a moment as any to frankly acknowledge the regretable ignorance of our profession in general and ourselves in particular in regard to this great subject. Even with the manifest advances made in laryngology we are barely on the threshhold of knowledge concerning the real physiology of the production of the exquisitely developed human voice. Here, too, we desire to express our appreciation of the great assistance you teachers of vocal instruction have contributed to our meager knowledge. Without you, it would have been even more chaotic than it is. Therefore, we come not so much to teach as to discuss with you the problems with which we are all concerned. These problems are no less real to us in our daily contact with patients than they are to you in your efforts with your students. We all need a standard for the anatomy and physiology of the normal voice from which we may attain a working basis and allow us to choose our material with at least the same degree of efficiency with which the violin maker chooses his wood or the sculptor his stone.

We would gain but little here to go into the details of the anatomy of the parts concerned with the production of the voice. It is highly didactic and all of you have it in detail in your libraries, if you will but take the trouble to study and understand it. Moreover, to learn the secrets of the production of the human voice by learning the anatomy alone is somewhat similar to inviting one to learn the alphabet this afternoon that he might enjoy a volume of Shakespeare tomorrow. It is almost like showing the congenitally deaf the anatomy of the ear that he may thereby understand what he never heard, or like giving lectures to teach those born blind the anatomy of the normal eye that they might appreciate the bloom

of the flowers, the beauty of autumnal foliage or the silvery shimmering sheen of summer moonlight on still water. In other words, the highly trained human voice is a special sense, almost as much as vision, hearing, taste, or smell. I desire to emphasize this very strongly because it seems to have been generally overlooked and but little reference made to this aspect of the subject anywhere. It is because of its great and complex development that it is so difficult to define and express the sense of the highly trained human voice. This, really is true of any special sense. We can tell you that we smell the perfume of a flower, but if you never had olfaction you could not understand what we meant any more than we would understand what you saw when you described the wonders of a sunset or the variegated colored coquetry of an Aurora Borealis if we had never had the sense of vision. We can describe for you the anatomy of the eye or the ear, detailed to the most minute parts, but, when you ask us just how the eye conveys vision or the auditory nerve conveys sound, we immediately cover our ignorance by resorting to the phrase that it is a "special sense," expecting you to accept that as final. Unfortunately, we are compelled to wear the same cloak when we discuss the voice and if you will but sympathize with us and understand that we are now so enrobed, we will continue.

The special senses, then, have much about them that is still mysterious. Perhaps they always will. For the matter of that we can say the same thing about radio. Still, we enjoy radio without knowing all its mysteries. We do, however, realize that we must have certain factors in our sending as well as in our receiving sets. So, too, do we know that certain factors are essential for good vision, good hearing and also for the production of good voice. It is the factors regarding the latter that we will now attempt to discuss.

In quizzing a class of laryngologists recently we propounded a questions which asked them to describe the organ of voice production. Every one described the larynx. When we asked the question we knew they would because that is what our text books have gotten into the habit of calling the organ of voice production. However, they were only as approximately correct as they would have been in describing the retina and optic nerve had we asked them to describe the organ of vision, or in describing the middle ear, had

we asked them for a description of the organ of hearing. The larynx is only a portion of the organ of voice production. The other part is the remainder of the entire respiratory tract. Should you question this, permit us to ask you to eliminate any part of the respiratory tract without influencing voice production. It cannot be done. The nose, its shape, its sinuses, its gracefully curving turbinals, its septum, its choana and even the hair-trigger uvula are all used some way, somehow in voice production. The mouth with its dental adnexa, the lips, the curtains which cover them, the cheeks in contraction or distention and the tongue all play their respective rôles while below the larynx at the end of the cartilagenous tunnel of the trachea and the bronchi we find even the delicate tinted pulmonary cells opening and closing pink petaled mouths to help sing or speak with even or intermittently flowing air the glories of the voice organ of which they are a part. And the great and little muscles of the chest and abdomen, including the powerful but delicately controlled muscled dome of the abdomen—the diaphram —are heardly less a portion of the organ of voice production than the great vocal bands themselves.

This may give you a new comprehension of the immensity of the subject. After all, it is only our viewpoint. Yours and others may be quite different but we feel most familiar with the subject and most capable of assisting your students and our patients when we accept the above as a working basis. We can easily realize, and thus help you, too, to realize the importance of irrevocably requesting and demanding as an undisputed primary essential in any student that he or she be at least physically fit from the standpoint of normal health in the entire respiratory tract. To attempt to make an orator or a singer out of a barrel or pigeon-chested individual is like entering a wooden-legged man in a marathon or expecting a cork-armed unfortunate to carry off the wrestling trophy. The student must be physically perfect at least as far as the respiratory tract is concerned. The more perfect physically in every respect the less is his handicap—all other things being equal.

In conversation with some of your members we learned that among the subjects that seemed to give more or less trouble and concern, the question of proper breathing was not among the least. They expressed a desire to obtain something constructive on this subject. You, perhaps, gather from the above that while we con-

sider the entire organ of vocalization to practically include the breathing apparatus we realize that all the voice producing organ is not involved in breathing as a considerable portion of it is then out of action. Different nervous systems are in control in these varying functions of the organs of voice and organs of respiration. Breathing is an unconscious act with conscious control—up to given limits—while voice production is entirely voluntary and a conscious act except under certain sub-conscious occasions as when partially under an opiate or anaesthetic or when in natural slumber, one unnaturally—and, if married, too often unfortunately—talks in his sleep.

The function of breathing as we all know is rather complex, but we realize it has three chief purposes. The first purpose is to carry certain gases, principally oxygen, into the fine, small, areolar pockets of the lungs where it bathes with its mild currents a most delicate layer of lining epithelial cells on the other side of which flows the blood in a beautifully regulated consistent stream. To this highly specialized delicate layer, is entrusted the power not only to choose from the air the constituents necessary in quality as well as quantity, but, the second purpose of breathing also depends on them. For, as they choose what they shall allow to pass into, so, too, do they regulate what they shall extract from the blood. This marvelous power of selectivity by cellular action is so wonderful that it baffles comprehension and seems to be the ultimate manifestation of life in physical matter before which every biologist stands in an amazement that approaches reverence. This fine highly specialized layer of cells then acts as an organ of excretion as well as absorption. You have all realized this when you happen to be sitting next to a connoisseur of the aromatic onion or garlic or he who defies the precepts of Mr. Volstead. More water is excreted by the lungs than by the skin or even the normally functioning kidneys. Because of its complexness but apparent simplicity and our general or commonplace knowledge, it seems superfluous to even suggest that breathing is important but these few remarks may assist in indicating why it is so important and necessary to life. We now come to the third great purpose of breathing. That purpose is phonation or vocalization and, for the moment, is the one about which we are particularly concerned. The lungs are large lobulated interestingly elastic structures located nearly wholly within

the bone raftered and domed thorax. Their apices extend slightly outside of this bony walled cavity into the neck. The amount of the chest space occupied by the lungs is, of course, very great and dependent on the lung structure including its enormous and constant blood content, the size of their structures such as the heart, pericardium, trachea, thymus, other glands, the large vessels contained in the chest, and, most important of all, the amount of residual air. During inspiration there is a constant flow of air into the lungs, the quantity being dependent upon such factors as the freshness of the air, the natural wear and tear of the system, the condition of the blood, and most significant of all, the factor of exercise. In normal, quiet respiration, there will be, of course, a minimum or relatively small amount inspired, but, as above stated, this amount may be greatly increased not only during great physical exercise as in fighting or running, but it may be increased when an individual may appear perfectly still as when fear, anger, concentrated thinking or other emotions predominate. But more even, perhaps, than in all of these do we find a greater capacity for lung distention in those who voluntarily and habitually practice deep breathing. Those who do this may have no larger chest capacity than some who do not, but here, as elsewhere, practice tends to produce ability and those who practice deep breathing soon become able to inspire more and therefore find more room for air than those who do not. We recall noticing this in some experiences we had in the army in training patients to wear gas masks. These observations were somewhat limited but we did observe that those who were vocalists, public speakers or those accustomed to diving were able to hold their breath longer than others during these tests. They were, presumably, on an average the same general size as the others but they had the ability to take more air in and therefore had a greater reserve than the others.

The development of reserve air capacity is important for vocalists as they often need it for prolonged and difficult phonation exercises or in extended public speaking. On the whole, I believe that public speaking requires more actual voice energy than public singing, because in public singing one covers a wider range of sound production. Thus, while singing the high scales certain groups of muscles and factors involved in the production of low notes are at rest whereas in public speaking more nearly the same

group of muscles and other vocalizing essentials are in continuous use. Of course, this is very varying and is perhaps a superfluous and unnecessary differentiation. At any rate, besides requiring inspired air for ordinary breathing purposes, public speakers and singers need this greater capacity for extraordinary vocalizing power.

Your text books will demonstrate to you the usual quantity of air inspired into the lungs. About 25 cubic inches is inspired with every breath on quiet breathing but forced inspiration may increase this so that three or four times that amount may be taken in. The normal respiratory rate in man is about sixteen to eighteen times a minute. Woman on an average breathes from one to three times more per minute than the average man. However, this rate may be developed or increased even more when necessary. Thus, we note that, not only may we inspire more air but we can take it in much oftener when occasions demand. There is a certain amount of air called the residual air which, in the average individual, is about one hundred cubic inches in quantity that we cannot expell no matter how hard we try. This, of course, is a very wise provision of nature's since the blood is so dependent on a constant flow of oxygen that it would otherwise mean almost instantaneous death if we yelled loudly and long, or at any rate long enough to thus literally "yell ourselves to death" or, expire in more than one sense. Because this residual air is present the blood may replenish its oxygen intake even though the patient suspends breathing for several breaths as we know that regardless of how much oxygen is thrown into the lungs only a certain amount is utilized at one time. The amount of oxygen consumed if only pure oxygen is forced into the lungs is little more, if any, than that normally consumed from ordinary air. We do not know as yet just what mechanism controls the oxygen intake though most likely the blood corpuscles in the lungs on each breath simply appropriate their capacity and go on their way, due, perhaps to a chemical or cellular selection action on their part, too.

The lungs are encased in a fairly strong bony box with a strong muscle dome below and somewhat similar boundries above. This wise provision of nature prevents the rupture of the hormal lungs by any abnormal or excessively deep breathing. Consequently, while breathing is somewhat under our control it is really

an involuntary act—subject to slight control. Within the limits of this control, it is subject to development. Development here, as elsewhere is attained by practicing rational exercise. As the development of breathing is only that which may be necessary to take care of the increasing physical needs of the athlete it is not so necessary for him to pay a great deal of attention to breathing because nature automatically takes care of that by compelling deeper breathing in accordance with the requirements of the blood and body during his exercise. However, deep breathing for pure vocalization is not done for such mere physical need. Rather is it for the development of something a little finer, a little higher; it is for the refinement of a special sense and therefore becomes more and more subject to the will which directs the power for its development. In other words, the athlete needs pay a relatively small amount of attention to his breathing as natural instincts attend to that, but the vocal artist must pay attention to it for he needs breathing almost as much for his vocation as he does for his body needs. How then should he attain proper breathing? We only wish we could make our answer as simple as our query.

There are almost as many rules and exercises in regard to proper breathing as there are those who claim to teach them. We do not care to add to them, but, perhaps, it might be advantageous to discuss the matter in a general way. We believe the easiest and most efficient way to do anything, generally speaking, is the natural way. That is certainly the easiest way to walk, talk, sing or do any of the things we usually do.

Desiring to become experts and highly trained in anything, of course, we needs must exert ourselves and progress onward from where we assume nature left off. However, nature did take us along the course quite far enough to show us that all we need to do is proceed a little further along the same course in which she started us. True of everything else, it is no less true of breathing. Therefore, we believe the best thing for the vocal artist to do to acquire proper breathing is to become at least an incipient athlete, to take up physical exercise, particularly running or any kind of exercise that requires deep breathing and undertake it to the point that you learn not only how to breath properly but, also, how best to conserve your breathing. When you have acquired this, you have acquired something no one except yourself can teach you. It is

easy—it is effective—it is wonderful—simply because it is natural. To teach breathing otherwise is like informing a child that all there is to walking is to stand erect and place one foot eighteen inches before the other in rapid succession. That statement may be correct, it may be all there is to walking, but that child will decorate his head and other parts of his anatomy with many beautiful red, yellow and purple bumps before he learns even the simple act of walking. Having acquired this athletic breathing, the student has covered much but by no means all the requisite breathing knowledge if he desires to become a great vocal artist. It is here that his teacher comes to his assistance and his teacher will bring to him that form of breathing exercise that his instructors and his own experiences have proven most worthy. As above stated, there are many of these exercises. However, we wish merely to restate that those are best which most nearly approach a continuation of the natural, consisting chiefly of regular periods of conscious breathing —these periods to be short but frequent by preference and the student to keep his mind and attention constantly concentrated on the act of breathing as he would on the piano, a problem in calculus, or on any great problem in which he might be much interested. With his attention so fixed, he should take slow deep inspirations, preferably in the open, clean, fresh air, filling the lungs slowly, gently, evenly, paying no attention to the so-called abdominal, costal or other methods because the only way one ever got any air into his abdomen was by swallowing it. All the student has to do is to remember that he is trying to fill his lungs with air and this, of course, means every part of his lungs. Having done that, suggest to him that he hold it and practice holding it. Then allow it to escape through the mouth as well as through the nose and repeat this exercise emphasizing and developing the depth of breathing, the length of time he can hold his breath and his control in allowing it to escape. We suggest allowing him to exhale with his mouth slightly open, because the mouth is not only an accessory air intake opening, but the opening from which speech should escape and its refinements be controlled and developed. By such studied breathing exercises the student will learn the natural and easy method of developing his breathing capacity to its limit; remembering that while all who live must breathe, breathing can be developed into something much more than merely breathing to live.

All normal humans have facile fingers that from childhood learn at first to do dextrous and difficult feats like buttoning their clothes, lacing their shoes, writing, and a thousand things so commonplace that their actual dexterity is forgotten, but it requires training and slow and studied efforts much beyond the ordinary to correctly fondle the neck of a violin and by proper fingering coax it to produce the wonderful music of the exquisitely developed artist. The music master may show you how to grasp the violin and the bow and where to place your fingers for each consecutive tone, but only natural ability combined with inherent artistry and painstaking practice in the silence of your studio or garret room will develop the real intricacies that you require and the results you demand. So, also, it is with breathing. Just realize the natural way of breathing and then practice, refine and develop it forgetting about your scapula, your neck, your shoulders, your chest and your abdomen, except of course, that you must assume a natural easy breathing position to begin with and retain that position as nearly as possible during all your exercises. Then the same factors of patience and persistence that entered into the production of the violinist or other finished artist will convert you into a finished breather.

With a well developed and controlled bellows you have progressed no little way toward the mystery of proper voice production. However, there is still much to acquire. The human ear responds to vibrations. Vibrations produce sound, and hearing is only the conscious interpretation of vibrations. We know that sound produces waves of motion and that these waves can be not only detected but accurately recorded and measured by perfected mechanical devices. Voice production means only the proper production of these vibrations. The finest poem ever written consisted only of the proper arrangement of the twenty-six letters of the alphabet. The finest music ever heard only consisted of the harmonious production of vibrations. The human voice, then, is only the vibrations of the breath, controlled, influenced and refined by the entire phonetic and respiratory tracts. Without resonators the human voice would be only a series of squeaks and other shrill discords, or perhaps, not even that. A human voice without resonators never existed. The resonators, then, are very important factors in voice production. We should give them at least a moment's consideration.

Proceeding from below upward, the first resonator is the contracted diaphragm influenced perhaps by the abdominal cavity below it. Then comes a much more important resonator, the thorax or bony chest. The chest has resonant qualities that are not often recognized and rarely attributed to it. The diagnostician who specializes in diseases of the chest finds that quality one of his greatest aids. You, perhaps, when a child or even later remember his placing the stethoscope on your chest wall and asking you to count. He listened for that resonance, or the lack of it as a pilot in dangerous waters listens for a lighthouse bell. This quality is easily proven to you too, when you phone a friend to come out with you some evening. He hesitates and asks you to wait a minute. Then placing the telephone mouthpiece against his chest so you won't hear him, he forgets that this wonderfully resonant quality is conveying to your ears through the mouthpiece his pathetic plea to his wife that she allow him to come with you, and when she refuses, you understandingly acquiesce and feel sorry for him when he informs you that he is very sorry but he unfortunately has another engagement which he has just remembered.

Placing your finger tips on your chest while speaking, you can easily feel these vibrations. They are even more easily detected when you place your fingers on the trachea, another resonator, and, best of all detected of course, when the finger tips are in contact with the larynx which contains the two flat elastic bands known as the vocal cords. These simple appearing bands, together with the longitudinal slits called the ventricles just above them, and the longitudinal folds or eminences abutting just above these ventricles which are called the false vocal cords are extremely interesting. These, particularly the true vocal cords, represent the essential machinery of the larynx and within the larynx we find the origin of nearly all the primary vibrations which we interpret as the human voice.

Just how it is produced is not even yet entirely revealed, though some believe they have solved the mysteries of the larynx. Honest observers have worked long and arduously on the question, and while much has been discovered and explained, there is much that is hidden, much that is unexplained. Some have tried to compare the vocal cords to a reed instrument, but they are analogous only in a minor sense. Others compare them to the lipping

of the cornet. Many comparisons are made but none are sufficient, for, after all, for variety, dexterity, adaptibility and all that goes into the production of pleasing sound, nothing will compare equally with the voice producing apparatus of the highly trained.

We should, I presume, mention the other resonators, those above the vocal cords—the pharynx, the choana or dome of the pharynx, the nose with its tunnels and its resonant and numerous sinuses, in fact there are many, many other things that we should mention, but we must hasten on as your time is short and valuable and we feel we have already imposed on it perhaps more than we should. However, I feel that we cannot close without reiterating and again calling your attention to a few of the most important things of this paper. Particularly do I want to emphasize the fact that your choice of student material is important.

You must choose only those who possess the proper physical qualification. If the physically unfit come to you, it is not only to your benefit, but to their infiinite advantage for you to insist on their becoming physically strong before you attempt to train them. If they need dental care, or have high arched palates, nasal obstructions, adenoids or the ubiquitous infected tonsils, or any other physical defect, do them the kindness and yourself the favor of commanding them to consult their medical advisor and remain under his care until they are pronounced normal. Your time is too valuable to teach the sick or delinquent, either in body or mind. The latter is also extremely important, because your success is essentially predicated on the very necessary high inherent intellectual, no less than on the finest physical qualifications of your students. A high grade moron with a rich father may pay his tuition promptly but he will never be a credit to you. Remember, too, that there are more morons whose parents are not rich.

To especially develop a special sense such as the voice, you will need every mental and physical advantage in your student. Permit us therefore, as a last word, to admonish you to refuse to waste your time unless the student approximates the ideal both physically and mentally.

THE PLACE OF PANTOMIME IN THE SCHOOL CURRICULUM*

WILLIAM H. BRIDGE
Hunter College

TO the revered heads of the departments of the 'ologies, Pantomime doubtless suggests some pleasant Tomfoolery, associated it may be with Drury Lane or some Christmas entertainment for the kiddies. To the student who recognizes the significance of all human activity and seeks to see in the endless variety of human conduct some account of life, Pantomime becomes a psychological and physiological process of first-class importance. Approach to it must be as serious as approach to the study of the heart, lungs and glandular mechanism. Curiously enough, while a certain academic value and dignity is given to the science of the interior organs, the movements and motivations of the external instruments of expression are not generally considered worthy of academic notice.

The fault lies mainly with ourselves as teachers of the arts of expression. We have not, as a rule, realized the scientific background of our work or been able to demonstrate its close relationship with the work of psychologist, hygienist and physiologist. Yet the connection is inevitable and obvious. If from the outset we understand *pantomime* to mean the normal physiological expression of thought and emotion, the claim will surely be granted that we may as fairly speak of morbid pantomimic conditions as of the morbidity of heart or lungs.

In other words, we are dealing not with an art as something added as a decoration to human conduct, but with a science and its inevitable art expression, as involved in the process of sane and healthy living. Pantomimic activity is as universal as heart activity and indicates as much the healthy or morbid condition of a human being.

Parenthetically, it may be well to point out that this under-

*Read at the Eastern Conference, New York, April, 1925.

standing of Pantomime may be subject to qualification. There will be those who will say that not every physiological expression of a desire or purpose is pantomimic. There are actions which not only achieve a purpose, but do so in such a way as to express a mood, or comment of the mind. For example, I walk towards a friend: (1) There is the automatic action necessary to enable me to get there. (2) There is the manner of my walk, expressive of my pleasure or surprise, and modifying the normal automatic process of walking. The qualification may be admitted. I merely claim the word *Pantomime* to cover the whole action and affirm it as rooted in the physiological economy.

Now the healthy young child is vigorously expressive, pantomimic. Every physical and mental stimulus finds easy and ready projection through the outward organs. When he thinks, he must *do* something about it. He grows physically and mentally through carrying out the impression he receives. Both impressability and expressability are keen and vivid. That is the joy and charm of childhood and indeed, of that genius which escapes the onslaught of the years. Watch that boy standing in a puddle, ecstatically feeling the ooze of the cold water through his shoes; that's Holy water to him! Or catch, if you can, the tremendous thrill of the mudhole where you first found tadpoles. . . . The theme is old enough . . .

"There was a time when meadow, grove and stream, etc."

We love the "Intimations of Immortality" lines, not because of their philosophical soundness, but because we all recall something we lost and must forever regret.

The fact is, something is done to childhood which destroys this first fine sensitiveness to the environing world. Personally, we refuse to believe that the loss of the capacity for joy which all but artists and constant lovers suffer, to be a part of the inevitable order of life. It is surely in part the result of mal-education. It is the result of presenting prematurely to the young mind, abstractions and symbols and of withdrawing interest and energy from contact with things. We teach botany before the young have learned to love flowers, and when they are yet playing with words (which are lovely and curious sounds wrung from the soul by vital experiences) we give them grammar: or we load them with words before there is experience adequate to give them

meaning or value. We withdraw them from life and give them commentaries on life by dead people. In a word, in spite of all that leaders of educational thought and practice have said and done, we insist on imposing upon children the literary standards and content of mature experience. We will not allow them to live their lives—we force them to live our own.

And with what results?

By the time the boy comes to college he is drugged with books. He doesn't know much, it is true. But he has lost all enjoyment of beautiful, strange sounds which belong to beautiful, strange experiences: words are but ink. The power of quick and joyous response, of vivid realization of the impinging world has given place to a quasi-rationalisation. Life has become all will, but the will, unillumined by imagination and perceptive power is inadequate to the realization of large and sane living. It may be objected that the average crowd of high school youngsters presents a picture of vigorous expressiveness, vocal and pantomimic, and not at all lacking in this power of response. Yes, there is vigor, there is noise and movement, and rhythm. But to what is the response made, what is the quality of the expression? I recently heard some ten high school groups, in competition, offer their own songs. In nearly all cases there was unlimited vitality, but there were raucous and nasal tones, undifferentiated and sickly sentiment: a complete absence of music, a complete dominance of jazz. You could not but feel the motive was a determination to win and that the perceptive and imaginative qualities had been drowned by the will to achieve.

I recently asked a class in Reading to prepare some lines of Whitman, choosing Whitman because I wanted to revive some sense of that fine, vigorous contact with simple things which is the joy of the great American . . . But it was pathetic to hear the first attempts of apparently intelligent, healthy college students muttering "Captain, my Captain"—with no lift of the torso, no straightening of the spine, nothing but a timid, monotonous little sound, related in no way to the body (apparently) and affecting the body not at all. These same youngsters had better voices and more responsive bodies when they were six. Education has deprived them of vocal power in the expression of noble feeling and fine thought by imposing a world of symbols essentially

the outcome of adult experience, at a time when the first need of the young being was to feel and taste and see and handle, to discover the world for himself.

I am tempted to quote a paragraph from a book which is packed full of meat for the Expression Teacher—Caldwell Cook's *Playway*—a delightfully human account of a great experiment in expression as an educational method. It is pertinent to my point that the imposition of adult forms upon the emerging spirit is the root of our troubles in vocal and pantomimic work:

"There sits the youth of England at its education: row upon row of magnificent boys, imprisoned in the stocks, and clad in ridiculous trousers and knickerbockers. Look at the lads in their Eton collars and their jackets and waistcoats. William Morris complained of having to wear two coats; one with a back and no front, and another with a front and no back. These are insane garments, which a due care for health and free movement would not allow, and which the faintest glimmer of a sense of beauty in clothes could not tolerate for a moment. Look also, I beg you, at the feet of the little men, those feet which you as a teacher have so often had to call to order. The boots alone of a group of modern schoolboys are enough to render impossible the school production of any play which claims kinship with the Greek. But, as Sir Toby says in 'Twelfth Night,' 'These clothes are good enough to drink in, and so be these boots too'—and no doubt knickerbocker suits and Eton collars and ploughboy boots are a good enough apparel in which to walk about stone passages and gravel yards, or to sit at a desk and imbibe the grammar of ancient tongues."

But my complaining is not of clothes alone. I am concerned with bodies and my plea for Pantomime arises from my reverence for the human body and a realization that poverty of voice and pantomimic expression is a symptom of actual organic breakdown, resulting from mal-education. It is only fair to add, not only that education is doing ill by the body, but that the whole trend of industrial civilization is against the upbuilding of fine, well-coördinated bodily organization. It is pertinent to recall what Stanley Hall wrote twenty years ago:

"Changes in modern motor life have been so vast and sudden as to present some of the most comprehensive and all-conditioning dangers that threaten civilized races. Not only have the forms of labor been radically changed within a generation or two, but the basal activities that shaped the body of primitive man have been suddenly swept away by the new methods of modern industry. Even popular sports, games and recre-

ations, so abundant in the early life of all progressive peoples, have been reduced and transformed; and the play age, that once extended on to middle life and often old age, has been restricted. Sedentary life in schools and offices, as we have seen, is reducing the vigor and size of our lower limbs. Machinery has relieved the large basal muscles and laid more stress upon fine and exact movements that involve nerve strain."

Of course, that carries beyond the school. But the fact is that the school aggravates the whole tendency. It does little to set the balance. No observer can fail to realize how large a proportion of our people, before middle age, become unshapely and grotesque in body, marred in countenance, graceless and clumsy in movement, incapable of free bodily response to mental and psychic stimuli, in address and manner crude, in speech and voice coarse and monotonous.

Can these things be true of our bodies and not true of our souls?

In pleading for a more distinctive place for Pantomime in the school curriculum, I am not claiming a cure-all remedy for the present condition. I believe, however, that pantomime properly used, not only can do much to stimulate respect for the body as an instrument of expression, but can definitely establish a better psycho-physical coördination and hence, a more healthy human being. May we pause a moment on this last point?

Health, in the large sense of *well-being,* is something more than freedom from recognized functional or organic disease. May we not define it as a condition in which every muscle does its job with readiness and economy, in which the sensory nerves are finely responsive to stimuli; a condition in which the nerves not only register the sight of a lovely sunset, the sound of a fine harmony, but in which such registration calls forth emotional response and terminates in motor impulse? By a healthy body should we mean one that handles tools (of weight and strain appropriate to its muscular power) with ease and efficiency, and in all efforts achieves its purposes with grace and comliness; a bodily condition in which the soul may work and in the actions of which the finest nuances of thought and feeling find expression? This is health: the right and normality of every civilized creature.

It is ridiculous to speak of a person being well-educated who does not in some degree approximate to this norm of good health.

If only the departments of Hygiene, Psychology, and Speech and Dramatics could put their heads together, out of the trinity might come an effort which would realize the Truth I am laboring at.

The connection between this ideal of health and the work of pantomimic expression is not difficult to establish. Says Stanley Hall:

"In a sense, a child or a man is the sum total of his movements or tendencies to move; and nature and instinct chiefly determine the basal, and education the accessory parts of our activities.

"The entire accessory system is thus of vital importance for the development of all of the arts of expression."

And—vice versa—the arts of expression are vitally important to the development of the entire accessory system—

"These smaller muscles might almost be called organs of thought. Their tension is modified with the faintest change of soul, such as is seen in accent, inflection, facial expressions, handwriting and many forms of so-called mind-reading, which, in fact, is always muscle-reading. The day laborer of low intelligence, with a practical vocabulary of not over five hundred words, who can hardly move each of his fingers without moving others or all of them, who cannot move his brows or corrugate his forehead at will, and whose inflection is very monotonous, illustrates a condition of arrest or atrophy of this latter, finer accessory system of muscles. On the other hand, the child, precocious in any or all of these latter respects, is very liable to be undeveloped in the larger and more fundamental parts and functions. The full unfoldment of each, is, in fact, an inexorable condition precedent for the normal development to full and abiding maturity of the higher and more refined muscularity, just as conversely the awkwardness and clumsiness of adolescence mark a temporary loss of balance in the opposite direction."

In a word, physiological structure and fitness go hand in hand with power of expression; effective training in the arts of expression becomes a truly hygienic discipline through which the neglected motor centres are brought into proper function.

In passing, may not the phenomenal desire to act, observable today both in our educational instruction and in society at large, be a kind of call from those neglected motor centres? May not the prevailing jazz rhythm be also a symptom of some such deep seated need?

It remains for us to add a few notes as to practical methods.

In the first place, I believe the best results are not obtainable through the production of plays, i. e., formal, "secondhand" plays. This conclusion I have come to after producing fifty or sixty plays as class work. The use of the finished play, the stereotyped line and minute stage direction, the definitely conceived characters, leaves no freedom for experimental expressiveness or creative impulse. Besides, we are so accustomed to pantomimic dumbness that in such plays the complete muteness of the body is unnoticed. Play production of the formal type should come much later in the training. A great part of the clumsy amateur acting prevalent everywhere results from a failure in basic pantomimic work.

In the second place, start rather without words; and without play. I suggest a series of about six pantomimes of incident to be performed with what variation and invention each student is capable, before the whole class. The assignment is given as follows: You will bring in next week the following pantomime: You are at home alone, it is evening, you are reading, awaiting the visit of a friend—he is late, you are impatient—you hear a noise, very slight, possibly below your window—it is nothing—after a while it is repeated, louder—you are startled, disturbed, and grow very nervous—the sound is repeated, nearer, louder: you are about to rush to the door, when a masked man jumps in through the window, holds up a gun, with the usual command—demands the rings off your fingers—anger and fear—you hand them to him—the door bursts open—enter the hero.

You will need to work it out at home; imagine positions of door, window, lamps, furniture. Work out the words you would say, if you were going to speak and which you therefore must say with your body. Make the story your own: don't be tempted to do what the last student did because it worked with him.

Scores of better situations will occur to the reader. The essential element is definiteness of emotional condition, with vigorous transitions; and at first, absence of complex or delicate condition; use the broad fundamental emotions: don't be afraid of melodrama, so-called.

As each member of the class works through the pantomime, the class will be keen to notice each bit of invention; they will look for variations. They will observe expressive action; they will

notice when the imaginary table has not been kept in place, or other created properties have not been duly held in the imagination of the actor.

After half a dozen such exercises, a number of important principles will have come to light. For instance, it will have become apparent that most people express similar emotions in similar ways. If the incidents are carefully chosen, occasions will arise when it is necessary to express such ideas as, *it is raining, you are very late, I'll come back tomorrow.* If, (as should be the case) no previous help is given, it is more than likely that such conditions will give rise to some elementary sign-language. Such language must be more or less universal to be effective; the ordinary signs of the deaf mute would not be acceptable. May I, in connection with this sign language, refer you again to Caldwell Cook's *Playmaking.* He has a delightful chapter on *Miming and Balads.* No one could read that chapter and fail to be convinced of the enormous value of this kind of pantomimic work, not only in developing the minds and bodies of the students, but in cultivating a finer appreciation for literature and stimulating the creative impulse.

These exercises will be followed by a group in which the student will not be himself, but an observed character; you will soon recognize members of the faculty, public characters. You assign types—a timid man, a sly man, a benevolent woman, a child of five . . .

This warning must be given in connection with life studies—the study must always attempt to be sympathetic. Do not allow the cartooning, the *take-off* of people, which does not reveal the character, but exaggerates and mocks. It is easy to imitate superficial characteristics. But a life-study is first an attempt to understand people by sympathetic observation; and then an effort to interpret (not to imitate merely) through the expressive instruments of your own body.

During these exercises, attention will be drawn by the instructor to the characteristic expressions of specific organs. Students will begin to study hands and what they say: feet, faces, shoulders, etc., will gradually become for them instruments by which they read the secrets of men's hearts and minds and characters: they will watch the bearing and manners of people—and

take more care of their own. One of the most gratifying fruits of these exercises is the quickened observation of life and better understanding of people. I can recall one case in which this keener and more sympathetic observation resulted in an amazing increase of social grace and effectiveness.

From these exercises in the pantomime of incident and of life study, the student will be led to observation of the modes of emotional expression, e. g.: How do anger, fear, joy, etc., make themselves known; discussion of the types of anger, etc., will follow. Life studies of fear, despair, affection will be brought in. Special attention will be drawn to the various organs of expression—feet, how they express anger, or joy, or timidity; the eyes, and so on. At this point, the program of Delsarte may well be introduced. The pantomimic meaning of each of the organs will come under discussion. A chart may be drawn of the human body, showing the details of expressive organs. I suppose people still hold Delsarte in contempt. Yet no one has given so accurate a statement of the expressive values of the organs of the human body. His program, if used with common sense, is an invaluable key to human behavior and character. I wish some teacher of expression (a practicel worker) with a good background of modern psychology, would re-work this field. Moses True Brown's *Philosophy of Expression* has not clarified our understanding very effectively. Montegazza, wrote his *Physiognomy and Expression* before the advent of modern psychology. Neither Miss Florence Adams nor Miss Stebbins have the viewpoint of the modern teacher.[1]

However, a careful digest can be made of these four books and possibly Darwin's *Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*, and the Pantomimic Program laid out in graphic form, not as a basis for gesture work, but as a kind of norm against which the expressive effort may be tested. In no case should there be any copying of gesture, but continually the question, "What do you feel like doing when you think that." It is a source of great satisfaction to find continually that this question elicits an answer which is confirmed by the pantomimic program. It is quite essen-

[1] But see also the recently published Greenleaf Theater Elements by Constance Smedley (Duchworth, London). A series of practical handbooks on action, speech, producion, etc. The volume entitled *Action* is quite the best thing yet done on practical pantomime work.

tial that the student become sensitive to this impulse, and that this sensitiveness be developed before any acting of another character or part be attempted. I am convinced we make a great mistake in thrusting the student into the deep water of expression before he has had opportunity to paddle about the shallows of mere play. He becomes prematurely earnest and serious and loses the play sense—which is fatal to his growth.

Altho not essential to the course, I have found that good results in spontaneous creativeness were obtained from a kind of impromptu scenario. Perhaps three members of the class are assigned to invent a simple situation, to write out the detail of the action and be prepared to caste and direct it, at the following recitation. The student, at the following recitation, reads his scenario: discusses his characters, the scene, etc., casts his play. The members of the cast discuss with him the characters they are to assume. If you have not tried this little stunt you will be surprised to find how much invention, quick witted adaptation to unexpected situation is often revealed.

All these exercises lead up to a detailed pantomimic treatment of speeches from Shakespeare. This is difficult and advanced work. The thought of the lines must first be mastered: the situation out of which the lines arise must be realized: the person addressed must be known: the silences, the listening places, must be as carefully analyzed as the speech itself, and for every phrase and movement the thought, emotion and the action mastered. There will be no trouble about words when this preparation has been made. When they are spoken, they will be spoken with the mind and through the body—they will be motivated and weighted with thought.

This is but a breaking of the ground. But the activity successfully initiated will propagate itself. The joy of discovering a medium of expression will lead the student towards continuous self-mastery. Very soon the student discovers that increased power of expression enhances the capacity to receive impression, that the world of men and women becomes an intriguing object of sympathetic interest. What actually happens is, we believe, the establishment of a better coördination, and hence a healthier state of mind, and body, in the realm of character and behavior, an enhancement of the interest of life and the capacity for joy.

THE OXFORD PLAYERS, THE CHERRY ORCHARD, AND THE PLAYHOUSE

C. D. THORPE
University of Michigan

"IMMEASURABLY the best play in London." "What is the best play in London? This is." It was this sort of thing the London *Times* and other reviews were saying about the Oxford Players' production of Anton Chekov's *The Cherry Orchard* this summer. It needed the recommendation of no dramatic critic, however, to send me at my first opportunity to *The Royal Theatre* to see for myself what Chekov's great play in an English version would be like.

I came away in a mood of exultation and exaltation, certain that I had just witnessed one of the dramatic triumphs of our age. I was also filled with curiosity to know more of Mr. J. B. Fagan and the Oxford Players whose mastery in interpretation and presentation had so impressed me. The name *Oxford Players* had raised the question as to what connection there might be between this company and Oxford University. Was Oxford University responsible for this wonderfully intellectual and sympathetic interpretation of one of the most subtly powerful dramas ever written? I remembered Arnold Bennett's account of the sad failure of the first attempt to stage *The Cherry Orchard* in English garb some twenty years ago—half the audience had left by the end of the second act—and felt that much of the secret of this present success must lie in the company. The next day I wrote Mr. Fagan asking for an interview. There came at once a gracious invitation to be present at *The Royalty Theatre* the following Wednesday evening, August 3, a date which would mark the Company's one hundredth consecutive performance of *The Cherry Orchard.*

What I learned of the Oxford Players and their work was so interesting and cheering to me, especially in connection with the possibilities of university dramatics that I felt readers of The QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION might be willing to

hear about it all. I know of nothing that has given me so vivid a glimpse of the possibilities of school dramatics in making the modern stage what it should be, a medium for the preservation and interpretation in attractive form of the best of the world's drama.

The Oxford Players are not, strictly speaking, university players. But the enterprise which brought the Company itself and *The Playhouse*, its Oxford home, into being had its inspiration in, and is directly an outgrowth of college dramatics. Every year the O. U. D. S.—Oxford University Dramatic Society—stages in addition to its minor plays, one big difficult production, calling down from London, on each occasion, some successful director to manage the affair for them. One of these producers who had served the O. U. D. S. in this way for several years was Mr. J. B. Fagan. Now Mr. Fagan has a passion for good drama, hating claptrap with all the intensity of his vigorous nature. He had often dreamed of restoring to the stage many of the neglected glories of its best days; he was struck with an idea. Here at Oxford was his chance; he would build a company around these talented, educated young university men; he would open a repertory theatre right here in the centre of university culture and would fulfil his dream of a real stage by offering to his public the finest type of old and modern play.

The result was the Oxford Players, and *The Playhouse*. *The Playhouse* is at Oxford. It is an old museum converted into a theatre and is a most suggestive example of what can be done with limited materials in the creation of a suitable place in which to house good plays. I examined it when I was in Oxford. The building is a long, low structure with what Mr. Fagan calls a "presentational stage" at one end. The construction of this stage displays the ingenuity of its inventor in devising something suitable for the varied kinds of drama he planned to produce. In general effect it is semi-Elizabethan, with an "apron" in front, and a proscenium about half way back, with a curtain opening on to an inner stage. If the "apron" only extended further out into the audience and if there were a balcony the stage would be quite Elizabethan indeed. As it is, it offers opportunity, with its "outer" and "inner" stages, and its two curtains for the swiftly

alternating scenes so desirable in Elizabethan productions, and for the variety of setting often required by modern plays.

The scenery and the settings used, however, are usually very simple. The stage is regularly furnished with black and white drops, and these in combination with a simple yet ingenious lighting system are adequate for most of the effects desired. Mr. Fagan is a specialist in stage lighting, as anyone witnessing *The Cherry Orchard* would at once recognize and I was curious to examine the system he had installed at The Playhouse. There are no footlights, four sets of ceiling and side floods furnishing all the lighting for the stage. One of these sets is unique in position in that it is located out in the house over the stalls, perhaps ten feet behind the orchestra pit; two pairs of side floods are concealed from the audience by pillars at either side of the stage; and one is placed behind the arch of the proscenium. With this fairly simple system, through the judicious use of a variety of colored lights in each set of floods, the Oxford Players secure the most appropriate and beautiful lighting effects.

In this improvised theatre, which seats in fair comfort something over five hundred people, the Oxford Players, organized as a repertory companay under the direction of Mr. Fagan, presented their first play in October, 1923. The enterprise was an instant success. Cultured, conservative Oxford liked the brand of drama the new company produced, and from the first gave it wholehearted support. Except for brief excursions into neighboring places, these players spend practically the entire academic year at *The Playhouse*. At the opening of each term they begin, as a rule, with a new play each Monday night; occasionally, however, they run a double or even triple bill to accommodate matinee crowds. This summer, Mr. Fagan took his Company in *The Cherry Orchard* to London where, as I have already noted, it was acclaimed "the best play of the season."

The list of plays this Company has staged in two years will give some idea as to the nature of its ambitions and the range of its activities. I give here only a few of them. The names in themselves tell an eloquent story. Curiously enough, though the stage is constructed with an obvious eye to the Elizabethan, only one Shakespearian play has as yet been presented—*Twelfth Night*, a decided success, I was told at Oxford. But the array of modern

titles is imposing: *The Cherry Orchard, Candida, Getting Married, The Dark Lady of the Sonnets, Overruled, Captain Brassbound's Conversion, Heartbreak House, The Admirable Crichton, The Twelve Pound Look, The Masterbuilder, The Lady From the Sea, Dandy Dick, No Trifling, Mirandolina, Mr. Pim Passes By, Importance of Being Ernest, Wurzel Flummery, The Man With a Flower, Deirdre of the Sorrows.*

There are still present in the Company three of the original Oxford University student players. One of these, Miss Virginia Isham, playing the part of Barbara in *The Cherry Orchard,* is said to be the first Oxford woman graduate to go on the professional stage. (The professional stage is most fortunate to have her). Another is Richard Goolden, as Firs, who was this summer temporarily absent playing with the Memorial Company at Stratford. I saw him in excellent interpretations of the French courtier, and clown son in *As You Like It* and *A Winter's Tale.* The third is one of the distinct stars of the group—Mr. R. S. Smith, who plays Simeon of Pishtchik in *The Cherry Orchard.*

I talked to Mr. Smith, a big, fine affable fellow, and found him, along with Mr. Fagan and others, expressing a wish I had already found myself fervently uttering—that the Company might come to America and play before our university students. Mr. Alan Napier, who, as Leonid Gayef, should share with Mr. Smith honors as stars in this really all-star cast, was in the dressing room when I was talking to Mr. Smith, and he most earnestly seconded the suggestion of an American engagement. I left the theatre with the firm resolve to do all in my power to make such an engagement possible.

The accomplishments of the Oxford Players should be thoroughly encouraging to American college dramatic societies. What has happened in England should be repeated many times in the next quarter of a century in the United States. How many potential repertory companies devoted to the kind of drama to which the Oxford Players have dedicated themselves are there in our own university dramatic clubs! The whole idea in connection with our hopes for a better stage in America is one to arouse most pleasantly optimistic anticipations.

FINDING DEBATE AUDIENCES

RAYMOND F. HOWES
University of Pittsburgh

IN several of the Public Speaking rooms at Cornell University hang pictures of former debate teams. There are some recent groups, of course, but the most intriguing are those which depict strangely mature young gentlemen of twenty or thirty years ago, their bewhiskered faces set stiffly atop high collars and wide flowing ties. Some are now financiers, professors, judges; others have passed into obscurity, leaving hardly a trace; but around the exploits of their undergraduate days hang romantic tales. Old timers on the faculty recall how this or that orator used to bring thunderous applause from assembled thousands as he turned what seemed certain defeat into glorious victory. They remember those golden days, now long past, when the Old Armory was packed to the rafters with cheering throngs, all in evening clothes; and one or two even retain memories of torchlight processions to welcome teams returning from battles on alien fields.

Those days are gone forever. Only on rare occasions, such as contests with Oxford or Cambridge, do audiences, at least in this part of the country, reach similar proportions. Far more typical of present day conditions in the east was a debate I heard in Maine last year, attended by less than eighty persons. A recent contest held near Philadelphia drew approximately forty, and at one in New York state not long ago, the net receipts from twenty-five cent tickets were less than five dollars. The foregoing debates were held on the home platforms of colleges situated in small towns, but institutions like the University of Pittsburgh, with the whole city from which to draw, seem to fare little better. At ordinary debates a crowd of three hundred is a rarity. Audiences of from sixty to two hundred are far more frequent.

This situation, which, from all the reports I can gather, is rather general, is the product of a number of causes, but all of them are fundamentally related to the question: Is debating a

game? Certainly twenty years ago it was so considered. The chief issue then was whether Yale or Princeton should triumph by the vote of the judges; the reaction of the audience to the question for debate was distinctly a minor consideration. It is only natural, therefore, that with the phenomenal growth of interest in athletics much of the enthusiasm for debating as a sport should disappear. Considered merely as a game, debating is undeniably less thrilling than football or basketball. Consequently those undergraduates who think primarily in terms of victories for the home team (among whom we must, if we are candid, include a large majority of modern American students) have gravitated from the forum to the stadium.

There can be little doubt that this tendency has increased in the past few years by the changes in American debating itself, changes brought about to a large extent by the adoption of English methods, and, what is vastly more important, the English attitude. Gradually, but nevertheless surely, debating is losing the characteristics of a game. The emphasis is shifting. The decision is becoming less and less important, the question for debate more and more the dominant interest. Audiences are being asked to decide questions on their merits; speakers from one institution debate on the same team with men from another, against a like combination; the open forum is rapidly growing in popularity; and several colleges have come to prefer no decision at all. That this attitude is, in the east, the rule rather than the exception is indicated by the fact that Bates college, which holds to the old tradition, has attracted so much attention. The pride of Bates in its long string of victories seems almost prehistoric, like the tomb of King Tut, and gains publicity for much the same reason. There is also plenty of evidence that western schools are rapidly adopting the newer attitude. To quote a debate coach at Iowa State college, "There is some tendency here to get away entirely from the 'decision-victory' complex, which is soothing."

Such a tendency is more than soothing; it is admirable in every way. Old debate strategems, such as holding the main point in the argument until the final rebuttal speech, which, as the author of one text puts it, "are often regarded as the meanest of tricks, but frequently lead to unexpected victories," are going out of style. Again, more students are being given a chance to debate.

Institutions which have accepted this new idea of the function of debatitng no longer pick one crack team of three men to do all the speaking for the season. One large eastern university last year selected fourteen men for teams at a single tryout; more than twenty different speakers have represented the University of Pittsburgh this season, at least half of whom had never appeared in varsity contests before. Such a system furthers to the highest degree the fundamental aims of debating: to present a sincere, fair case, and to train as many students as possible in argumentation.

The unfortunate fact remains, however, that as this method develops student audiences inevitably drop away. Appeals to school spirit usually have little effect. It does not solve the problem merely to say that audiences are not essential, nor does it add to the popularity of debating to make undergraduate attendance compulsory. If the primary consideration in an intercollegiate debate is the presentation of the question discussed, it is simple logic that the discussion fails of its purpose if practically unheard. And on the other hand, students who are compelled to listen "for their own good" rarely benefit either the occasion or themselves.

The solution of the difficulty, it seems to me, lies in an entirely different direction. When the mountain failed to come to Mohammed, Mohammed, showing rare common sense, went to the mountain. If collegiate audiences fail to come to debates, why not take the debates to other audiences? If, as is usually the case, the question to be discussed is an important social, economic, or political issue, why not debate it before voters, to whom the information received will be of real value? In every city in the country there are social organizations, Chambers of Commerce, luncheon clubs, and political clubs which would be glad to have their members and friends thus enlightened, and frequently a high school in a town where there is no university jumps at the chance to hold an intercollegiate contest. There can be no doubt that a debate manager sincerely desirous of finding an audience outside his own college town can do so with comparative ease.

That this plan is practicable is attested by the fact that it is now in use in various forms in many parts of the country. One of the most illuminating notes in the February number of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL was that from Albion college, in which Mr.

Ewbank described what he rightly called "some constructive work in practical debating." It was no mere chance that brought five hundred people to hear an open forum discussion of an amendment to the Michigan state constitution. The debaters of Albion not only chose a subject of interest to the people of that state, but took their discussions to places where those people naturally assemble. From a brief conversation with several Western Reserve debaters not long ago, I gathered the information that discussions such as these held before clubs and other public assemblies in various places near Cleveland, constitute a well developed part of that institution's debating activity. Doubtless few other schools have organized this phase so fully, but debates on neutral ground are frequent throughout the country, and usually, if I am not misinformed, attract audiences of more than ordinary size.

At Pittsburgh this year we have held three debates in accordance with this plan, and all were eminently successful. One team met Colgate at Scranton, Pa., before a large crowd. The debate was managed by a high school which had the active coöperation of the alumni organizations of both institutions. On another occasion two teams from this university discussed a dominant campaign issue before a men's club in an outlying church. The enthusiasm aroused by that discussion is difficult to describe. It inspired several of the members of the club to make speeches afterward, in which gratitude for the information received and praise of higher education were expressed in glowing terms. It developed later that more than half the members of the club, who had opposed the entire LaFollette platform merely because of ignorance of its content, had definitely modified their opinions on at least one point, and had decided to investigate the merits of other points before rendering a sweeping decision. In much the same way teams representing the University of West Virginia and the University of Pittsburgh met this winter in the Westinghouse plant at East Pittsburgh. The subject was the proposal that Congress should have the power, by a two-thirds vote, to override decisions of the Supreme Court involving the constitutionality of federal statutes, a subject which made a distinct appeal to the Westinghouse employes, many of whom were LaFollette supporters. The hall was packed, and the response to the points made by both teams was enthusiastic.

Such a plan, then, is certainly practical and worth while. Not only has it all the advantages to be derived from the usual system of holding all the contests in a given hall on the campus: not only does it give valuable training to a large number of debaters, and shift the emphasis from the "decision-victory" complex to the higher ideal of presenting a fair, accurate, able discussion of the question at issue; it has the further merit that it brings questions of national importance to the attention of voters who, if they would guide the affairs of the nation intelligently, must be supplied with information about those affairs. If the Child Labor Amendment, the World Court, the League Protocol, had been debated fairly and openly before audiences of voters all over the country, would the public sentiment have been the same toward them? The answer is problematical, but it is interesting to speculate. At all events it is clear that intercollegiate debates could be made a mighty force in American public life if they could reach enough people. Here is a real opportunity for service, a call to duty which American debating has too long neglected, but which, if it is to live up to its high tradition, it cannot further ignore.

THE USE OF STRATEGY IN DEBATE*

WARREN CHOATE SHAW
Knox College

THE subject of strategy in debate, its use and misuse, or abuse, can never fail to be a topic of the most absorbing interest to all teachers and students of the debater's art; for, somehow or other, though this subject is as old as controversy itself, it has never ceased to have about it an air of mystery and of doubtful respectability, as if it were allied with the black arts of magic, and as if it consisted chiefly of deceitful trickery such as is practiced by word-juggling sophists and pettifogging charlatans.

Yet is it reasonable that strategy should always be regarded as a thing of mystery and as a means to make the worse appear the better reasoning? Why should it not also be regarded as a thing that all may know and as a means to be employed by honest men

*Read before the National Association of Teachers of Speech at Chicago in 1924.

to make the truth prevail, to catch the charlatan in his trickery, and to expose the sophist in his shallow reasoning?

To careful, thorough students of the debater's art, there is no mystery connected with any form of debating strategy, and there can be no disreputable practice that parades under the name of strategy, which is not capable of being met and overthrown by better strategy.

For any sweeping condemnation of all debating strategy, there is but one explanation; and that is, that the critic is misinformed concerning what constitutes the real strategy of debate, or, if not misinformed, that he lacks the comprehensive view or the power to discriminate between good and bad.

To get rid of the critic's misapprehension and confusion, let us try to determine, first of all, what the real strategy of debate is. There are those, I know, who believe that debate strategy consists in spying out beforehand an opponent's case, in creating conditions that will make a fair hearing for an opponent impossible, and in tampering with those who are called upon to render a decision. Now, such practices as these, utterly contemptible and despicable in themselves, I regard as being no part of the real strategy of debate; for these practices are connected with the preparations and arrangements for debate rather than with the debate itself. If such practices deserve to be called strategy at all, they are the contemptible strategy of debate management and not in any sense the real strategy of debate proper.

What I regard as the real strategy of debate is not concerned with debate management but rather with the building up of cases and the preparation of speeches. It is concerned with the selection of facts and arguments to be presented and with the development of a definite plan of campaign to make these facts and arguments count most heavily by surprising, astounding, overwhelming, confusing, way-laying, or trapping an opponent.

To make these forms of strategy attractive, I like to think of them in terms borrowed from military usage, such as the strategy of direct and overwhelming assault; the strategy of scattering the enemy's forces; the strategy of skirmishing; the strategy of drawing the enemy's fire; the strategy of bottling up the enemy; the strategy of evading traps; the strategy of a concealed objective; and the strategy of withholding reserves.

Such names as these may lead some critics to believe that, after all, there is a mystery in strategy; but, if these critics could only bring themselves to study the significance of these names, they would find at once that they were on familiar ground among the long-known, fundamental principles that from remotest times have formed the kernel of the debater's art.

They would discover that among these ten forms of strategy there are two outstanding groups: the first and larger group, comprising as a whole the strategy of aggression or the strategy of a strong case; and the second, smaller group, comprising as a whole the strategy of evasion or the strategy of a weak case.

To demonstrate that there is no mystery in debate strategy, let me enumerate the objects and the means of the two outstanding groups of strategy. The strategy of aggression, that is, of the strong case, seeks either to obtain compact, heavily-laden, cumulative reasoning such as is evident in a good brief; or to bring about the most complete clash of directly opposite view-points by turning the tables in argument on every main point of the case; or simply to keep the whole list of issues constantly alive and constantly threatening; or to draw the discussion back to the more important and vital issues; or to clear the ground of unimportant issues by means of sweeping concessions and admissions; or to catch an opponent in a dilemma by well-chosen challenges; or to advance cautiously against popular prejudices from admitted premises to an ultimate distasteful conclusion.

In contrast with the strategy of aggression, the strategy of evasion, which is the strategy of a weak case, has a very different object and very different means for attaining its object. This general type of strategy seeks always to evade the issues, sometimes by deliberate and far-flung discussion of irrelevant matters, sometimes simply by setting up a totally different set of alleged issues; and quite frequently by postponing necessary constructive proof under the issues until there can be no opportunity for reply.

When we consider these objects of debate strategy and the means for accomplishing them, can we truthfully say that we think there is any mystery connected with this subject? We must rather admit, I think, that these forms of strategy are merely essential devices to permit the debater to demonstrate his highest skill and to apply his knowledge of fundamental principles in argumentation.

There is no mystery, then, connected with the real strategy of debate, and likewise I believe that there is no foundation for the criticism that debate strategy is altogether an art to be practiced by sophists and charlatans. The truth of the matter is that there never was a debate in which time limits for discussion were wholly absent, and the existence of these time limitations always makes necessary, among honest men as well as among charlatans, the very best use of all his skill in debate. He must employ devices to get at truth quickly or to raise doubts quickly and postpone decisions. This means then simply one thing—the honest man, as well as the charlatan, must employ some arts of strategy.

But let us look at this thing from another angle. When an honest man is confronted with crooked strategy, what is he to do about it? Is he also required to use crooked strategy, to fight crooked strategy with crooked strategy? Most fortunately he is not; for if perchance the crooked strategy consist in deliberate falsehood, then the honest man may know that falsehood never could bear the light of truth; and, if the crooked strategy is merely a device to evade, then the honest man may rejoice that for every form of strategy of evasion there is a form of aggressive strategy that exposes and demolishes it. This, however, is not all that should cause him to rejoice; for, in addition, he should realize that he, in upholding a strong case, has three types of aggressive strategy that he may employ to every one of the few types of evasive strategy that are at the disposal of his adversary.

Can we condemn the arts of strategy altogether and without reservation? If we do, I am of the opinion that we shall have to speak with disapproval of the works of some of our country's greatest debaters. We shall have to denounce much of the debating skill of Patrick Henry as demonstrated in the handling of his argument against the adoption of the Constitution; of Robert Y. Hayne and of Daniel Webster in the Webster-Haynes Debates; of Webster in the White Murder Case; of John C. Calhoun in his last great speech on the slavery question in the debates of 1850; and of Stephen A. Douglas and Abraham Lincoln in their superb series of debates in 1858.

The truth of the matter is that strategy itself is not to be condemned so much as those who sometimes use it. In the hands of the charlatan it may be a dangerous weapon; and in the hands

of a novice it is generally dangerous also, but only to him who uses it, and, if awkwardly handled, is wearisome, boresome, and even disgusting to an audience.

What then shall we as teachers do with it? Teach it, to be sure, if only to guard our innocent wards from pitfalls that await them. But do not make it the be-all and the end-all of debate. Teach it last, after a thorough grounding has been given in the much more fundamental principles of proof, conviction, and persuasion. Teach it by the example of the great masters. But, first of all, be sure of the ground in which you seek to implant it. Be sure of the man. Be sure that in him nothing counts but the truth. In such a man there need be no fear from strategy; for he will use it only as a mighty weapon to destroy error and to make the truth prevail.

WHAT IS A SUCCESSFUL SPEECH?

WILLIAM NORWOOD BRIGANCE
Wabash College

WHAT is a successful speech? The question has been raised by a correspondent, Mr. Edwin G. Flemming, in the Forum of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL for November, 1924. It was also raised informally in the hotel lobby during the last National Convention at Evanston. For teachers of speech and speakers themselves it is an important question. Were Lincoln's speeches in his debate with Douglas successful speeches, even though he lost the senatorship? Could that masterful address to the jury by William H. Seward in behalf of the negro, William Freeman, be classed as a successful speech although the jury returned a unanimous verdict against him? Could Burke's immortal appeal for conciliation with America be rated as a successful speech when his proposal was voted down by the House of Commons? Is any speech to be judged a success or failure solely or chiefly upon whether it gains or loses the immediate verdict?

It might be well at the beginning to distinguish between a *successful* speech and a *great* speech. The first is judged by its attainments, the second by its qualities. It is certain that many successful speeches are not great speeches—they succeed because

of an easy target, a friendly audience, or lack of opposition. It is equally certain that a great speech may, against blind passion, prejudice, ignorance, or bribery, likewise be unsuccessful.

Even so, the definition of a successful speech is elusive. When one is formulated that circumscribes the whole field, it includes much else besides; when it is contracted, many elements of successful speaking are excluded. One is reminded of the proverbial attempt of a small boy to carry three watermelons in his two arms. They could not encompass the three melons—yet if the boy reduced the load to his carrying capacity, one melon must be left behind. The dilemma seemed inescapable until the boy, with a hint of Alexandrian strategy, ate one melon and carried away the other two in his arms.

It would seem that we too must distribute the load; that rather than bound the field of successful speeches with a single definition, we must circumscribe the field through a chain of partial definitions.

1. As a starting point for our chain[1] we might first inquire as to the speaker's *audience*, for in testing the success of any speech we are aided in knowing the characteristics and qualities of the audience at whom it was aimed. To some extent it depends upon the *composition* of the audience, i. e. whether it is a general and mixed audience, or a select audience made up, let us say, of lawyers, teachers or labor unionists. Still more does it depend upon the *attitude* of the audience—whether they are friendly, hostile, critical, or indifferent. Finally in no small degree it depends upon the range of the audience—whether the speech is directed at *hearers* only or, as in the case of inaugural and other addresses, at *readers* also. It will be easily seen that each of these elements determines in part the success of any speech. Einstein, expounding his theory of relativity before an audience of scientists, might convince them of its soundness, whereas a college professor of literature in the same audience might find himself unable even to comprehend the speech. Yet the speech, if it wins converts among the scientists, must be accounted a success. In other words a given speech of

[1] A debt of obligation is here recognized to Mr. C. E. Lyon of the University of South Dakota and Mr. J. M. O'Neill of the University of Wisconsin both of whom, in their classes and in private conversation, have given me much of the material that follows.

this sort would depend for its success largely, and in some cases entirely, upon the scientific knowledge of the audience to whom it was given. So with the *attitude* of the audience toward a speaker or his subject. If it is favorably disposed, a mediocre speech may, from the standpoint of its immediate effect, be successful; whereas the same speech delivered before a critical, or even indifferent audience, would be a failure. To illustrate:

During the presidential campaign of 1924 I attended a political meeting at which two Republican speakers of national repute were to speak. Perhaps ninety per cent. of the audience was strongly Republican, with the remainder neutral and hostile. The first speaker—courtesy restrains me from naming him—went into the throes of agony. He called upon the Creator to witness that Calvin Coolidge was a plain man of the people, that he had tossed hay in summers on his father's farm, that he had warmed his feet in winters before a wood fire stove, and that therefore he ought to be elected. The speaker's voice and bearing, however, were excellent and when he had finished the audience broke into an uproar of applause and called him back for more. Yet I, not being an "old guard," was disgusted, even nauseated at such an obvious *argumentum ad populum* coming from the lips of a presumably intelligent man. I did not stand alone in this attitude for every critical, independent voter in the audience with whom I afterwards talked was of the same opinion. Following this speaker arose the second one—Mr. Nicholas Longworth, now Speaker of the House of Representatives. In slow, measured words he expounded the cause of tax and tariff reform. I was impressed, my critical, independently voting friends were impressed—yet the old guard gave him but a scant measure of applause. Now out of pure professional curiosity I also interviewed some six or seven of this old guard as to the relative merits of these two speeches. To a man they thought the first speech better than Mr. Longworth's. Before a paradox of this sort it is indeed easy to say which is the *better* speech but it is not so easy to say which is the more *successful* one. To a friendly old guard audience which needed to be fired to a campaign heat, the first speech was undeniably a success, yet it was a poor speech and nauseated every neutral voter in the audience. Conversely Mr. Longworth's speech, judged by its qualities, was an excellent speech and as a vote getter, a suc-

cess, yet as a party whip it was a failure. Here again we are sharply reminded to use extreme care in discriminating between good and successful speeches. In the final rating of these two I would place Mr. Longworth's not only as the better but also as the more successful for this reason: It is a higher and more difficult end to challenge respect from opponents and win independent votes than to arouse partisans into a frenzy. Political campaigns are won, not by the plaudits of proponents but by the gaining of independent and opposing votes, and to the speech that achieves that end goes the highest award of success.

2. After considering the audience, we might next consider the *plane of speech*. That is, is the speech for *utility*—to win votes, to get money, or arouse enthusiasm in a cause—or is it for *art*—to satisfy the higher demands, to inspire and uplift? If the plane be *utility* even though it is crude, lacking in the essentials of a great persuasive speech, yet if it wins votes, it is (in spite of its crudities and not because of them) a successful speech. Again if the plane be *utility* and even though the speech be adorned with all the graces of a Burke and allusions of a Philips and it does not advance its case, it is a failure. It may be a great speech but still it is a failure. Yet again, if the plane is *art*, to inspire and uplift, as on the occasion of an eulogy or anniversary, and the speech be crude and lacking in beauty and inspiration, it is a failure and nothing can elevate it to the plane of a successful speech; whereas if it does possess these graces it is a success. This consideration of the plane of speech seems to me to be one of importance yet one that students at least, tend to overlook.

3. We next come to *the specific end of the speech*. The general ends—instruction, belief, action, impressiveness, and entertainment—are not enough. They must be specifically applied. If the general end is *action*, we must further know what kind of action—votes, money, service, what? To illustrate: If Burke, in his appeal before the House of Commons for conciliation with America, actually had in mind only the immediate object of gaining votes in that house, then his speech—profound and excellent though it is—could scarcely be rated as a success. But if Burke had for an object—as Mr. Robert Hannah states in THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL for April, 1925,—not gaining of votes already bought and paid for by George III, but of reaching beyond Parliament and carrying his

appeal to the whole British nation, then his appeal was an undeniable success. Here again we must distinguish between a great speech and a successful one. No matter how one may choose to rate the success of Burke's effort there is but one pedestal upon which we can place its qualities.

4. The last link in our chain of definitions for a successful speech, and by far the most important one, is the progress it makes toward attaining its goal, for the *success of any speech is determined, not by whether it carries the day, but by how far it moves toward that goal.* It is obviously ridiculous to demand that every speech, to be called successful, must win an election or gain a majority. One speaker might face an easy task and succeed with a poor speech whereas another speaker, confronted by a vastly bigger—a task perhaps too big for any single speech—may gain many converts, cast doubts in many other minds of the opposition, yet fail to carry the day. But if it has advanced its cause further than the first speech it is the more successful of the two. To deny this would be as ridiculous as contending that a high jumper who cleared the bar neatly at three feet jumped higher than another who failed to clear it at six feet. Suppose a legislature is arrayed 74 to 26 against a tax reform bill until some able proponent, making a last minute speech for the bill, so shakes up the vote that it shifts to 52 to 48, but still against the bill. Is the speech that changes 22 votes a failure simply because the bill is lost? Would it not in fact be a more successful speech than another one which might gain just the three more votes necessary to carry the measure? I believe we might go even further than this. A speech that stirs up doubts in our minds, shakes our convictions, even though it does not change our vote or any other vote, is still a successful speech. Mr. Nicholas Longworth, in his speech referred to above, did not convince me fully of the wisdom of the Mellon Tax Plan but he did profoundly influence my thinking and attitude upon and left me with a desire to consider further the bill. I would, therefore, rate his speech as successful.

Not one but many factors, then, determine the success or failure of a speech—the composition and attitude of the audience, the plane of speech, the specific end, the extent that it moves toward the goal—all these things must be considered. In short, *the success of any speech depends upon the speaker's purpose, the ob-*

stacles to be overcome, and the progress it makes toward overcoming these obstacles. It does not follow, then, that because Lincoln's debate with Douglas failed to elect him senator, it was therefore a failure. If it gained any votes for Lincoln and lost any for Douglas then, for Lincoln, it was a success. Nor can we forget that Lincoln's avowed purpose, higher than his desire for election as senator, was to prevent Douglas from becoming president in 1860. Here again he was successful. Because William Jennings Bryan three times toured the United States as a presidential candidate and each time was defeated, does not lead us to believe that he was a failure as a speaker. If we weigh the attitude of his audience—some friendly, some neutral, some hostile—and can say that he aroused his supporters to enthusiasm, won votes from the independent voters, or created doubts in the minds of his opponents, then he was a successful speaker. Even had Burke's efforts been admitted failures in their utilitarian end of influencing the British parliament and even (if we can imagine it) the British nation had never read them—yet if we today are stirred reading them, we may fairly say that they are successful productions of the *art* of eloquence and as models are useful as such.

SPEECH CORRECTION WORK IN THE SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MABEL FARRINGTON GIFFORD
San Francisco Public Schools

THE speech correction work in the San Francisco public schools dates back to September, 1916—a time when the subject was still in its pioneer stage in the United States. Detroit, Chicago, New York and Minneapolis were already carrying on similar work, it is true, but at that time only a few of the most severe cases were being handled in these cities.

In San Francisco under the supervision of the writer a special survey was made as follows: the Superintendent of Schools sent a notice to each school in the city, through the regular school bulletin, asking that all speech defect cases be listed. The city was then divided into five districts, one central school being chosen as the center for each district. The speech defect cases were sent to these

centers on different days of the week, with the result that the city was covered in one week. The cases were classified and instructed to report at different periods as follows:

Primary, stutterers	9:00- 9:30
Primary, articulation defects	9:30-10:00
Grammar Grade, stutterers	10:00-10:30
Grammar Grade, articulation defects	10:30-11:00
High School Students, nervous speech disorders	
(1) Stuttering, cluttering, nervous hesitations	11:00-11:30
(2) Articulation defects and foreign mispronunciation	11:30-12:00

From each school a teacher was sent to listen for training and each day she gathered the groups having defective speech for one half-hour drill. Cases of nervous speech disturbance and articulation defects were of necessity handled separately. The time allotted to speech correction work varied from 40 minutes to one hour a day.

The next problem was to provide adequate instruction for teachers, to enable them to carry on the work intelligently and efficiently. Training classes for teachers in the fundamentals of speech defect work were therefore started by the writer through the University of California Extension Division, and a free speech clinic, which had been started by her the previous year at the University of California Medical School was used for practice work. Thus through the class work, and by means of direct observation and practice at the clinic, the teachers gained a fair idea of the work. The course, as originally started, covered a period of eighteen months. It was given once a week on Saturday mornings at the University of California Medical School. The necessary background of anatomy, physiology, pathology, and abnormal psychology was furnished through lectures given by a number of the physicians of the Medical School staff.

From July, 1919, to June, 1923, the teacher training work was transferred to the State Teachers College in San Francisco, where two courses were given, one to student teachers at the college and the other, an extension course, to teachers in service in the San Francisco School Department. Since January, 1924, the work has again been taken over by the University Extension Division.

At first the writer not only gave the teachers' courses but also held speech centers and taught all the classes in the presence of the various teachers in training.

From this simple beginning the work has been developed so that at present there are twelve speech centers in the elementary schools and three all-day assistant supervisors who rotate in these centers. The centers serve the purpose of training inexperienced teachers and are held once a week. Most teachers are glad to avail themselves of the training classes, but others depend upon the work of the centers for instruction. Stutterers only are in attendance here, except that the attendance of articulation cases as well as that of stutterers is required from the school in which the center is held. The centers, however, are not an arbitrary feature of the speech correction work and may be dropped for a semester or longer and then taken up again, as the need arises. When the centers are discontinued the assistant supervisors are free to visit the speech classes as they are conducted in the schools. The speech teacher gives from 20 to 60 minutes of her time daily to this work, depending upon conditions in the school. In schools where the speech teacher is also the opportunity teacher the time is evenly divided between the two main branches of the subject, namely, half an hour to the nervous speech disorders and half an hour to the articulation work. In addition to the work by regular speech teachers each class teacher devotes five minutes a day to articulation drill. This is compulsory in each school.

The classification of speech defects in current use is the following:

I. *NERVOUS SPEECH DISORDERS*
   1. Stuttering (rapid repetition of the initial element, consonant or vowel, of words. For example: t-t-t-to)
   2. Stammering (spasmodic action of the speech organs, audible or silent. For example: I c———n)

   (*Note:* In an effort to simplify, we are now grouping stammering and stuttering under one term stuttering, as is done in Europe.)
   3. Hesitation (excessive self-consciousness and lack of poise)
   4. Cluttering (rapid, choppy, indistinct speech)

II. *ARTICULATION*
   1. Lisping: s - z - sh - zh - ch - j (Protrusion of the tongue; substitution of the "th" sound)
   2. Lateral: s - z - sh - zh - ch - j (Substitution of thick sounds for these elements, like an unvoiced *L*)
   3. Infantile speech (Baby talk)
   4. Defects from malformation of the nose, throat, or teeth (obstructions to clear speech.

III. *FOREIGN ACCENT*
Foreign pronunciation, foreign inflection and word stress.
IV. *ENUNCIATION*
1. Sluggish, indistinct speech (careless speech)
2. Tense speech, no jaw action.
V. *VOICE DEFECTS*
Harsh, hoarse, weak, high, shrill, nasal, tense, monotonous, disagreeable, no resonance.
VI. *SPEECH MANNERISMS*
Slurring, gasping, affectations, drawling, clipping words, use of unnecessary words.
Note: We usually include FOREIGN ACCENT under ARTICULATION. Subjects I and II are of course the most important.

The text books in use are as follows: For use in the treatment of the Nervous Speech Disorders the San Francisco Board of Education is now about to publish the writer's new book, *First Aid in the Correction of the Nervous Speech Disorders.* For articulation work the text in use in Birmingham and Krapp's *First Lessons in Speech Improvement,* published by Scribner. The material in this book is helpful in handling infantile speech, foreign mispronunciation and sluggish enuncation. Each teacher is also provided with a condensed pamphlet describing the peculiarities of each of the foreign languages and the difficulties encountered by the various nationalities in learning English. This pamphlet is quoted from the article by Miss Sarah T. Barrows, entitled *English Pronunciation for Foreigners.* Five articulation drill cards have also been printed in convenient form, showing the correct formation of all the consonants and vowels, and giving practice work for the improvement of the enunciation. These five cards are planned to cover a term's work at the rate of one card a month and may be repeated in the same order each term. Supplementary to the articulation drill cards is a card upon which are printed descriptions of various tongue gymnastics. The use of the first two books is confined to the regular speech teacher, but the other material just enumerated is in the possession of every teacher in the school, and is used by her in the five minute articulation drill period.

At present the speech cases are referred to the special class either by the class teacher or after a school survey by the supervisor or assistant supervisors. In connection with this work special examinations are held at the speech clinic under the auspices of

the Medical School and Hospital of the University of California, and any teacher is at liberty to refer puzzling cases there and to visit the work personally. Where the speech defect seems to involve physical abnormality or the question of mentality pupils are sent to the proper department at the University for examination Throughout the year the speech clinic gives free service to the San Francisco school children on Saturday mornings from 9 to 12. Naturally the classification of speech defects is more comprehensive here than in the public schools. It is as follows:

1. **The nervous speech disorders, under which come stammering, stuttering, cluttering and nervous hesitation.**
2. **Retarded speech in both normal and subnormal children.**
3. **Infantile substitutions not caused by mouth malformations.**
4. **Substitution of sounds or imperfect speech caused by malformations of the speech organs.**
5. **Voice defects, not organic.**
6. **Voice defects after certain operations, such as cleft palate or adenoid.**
7. **Imperfect speech through partial deafness.**
8. **Aphasia, sensory or motor.**
9. **Foreign substitution of speech soupnds, caused by foreign environment.**
10. **Sluggish enunciation due to poor muscular coördination, which may possibly have been caused by certain diseases of childhood.**

For several years state certification has been granted by the State Board of Education for teachers who have taken the practical and theoretical background lectures, and have had two or more years experience in the successful handling of speech defects in the public schools.

The status of speech correction in the San Francisco public schools during the Spring term, January to June 1924 is shown by the following figures: the work was carried on in 90 schools, including two junior high schools, and six high schools. The total number of stuttering and articulation cases treated was 2955, of which 1051 were stutterers, and 1904 articulation cases, including foreign mispronunciation. Of the total number 2461 were either improved or corrected.

Although the progress in speech correction work has been slow from the point of view of enthusiastic teachers, statistics show a steady increase in both the numbers enrolled and in those corrected and improved. With the recent greater systemization of the work and with the increased interest and coöperation shown by parents, the future gives promise of still more gratifying results.

EDITORIAL

LOGIC AND ARGUMENTATION

NO article that has appeared in the QUARTERLY in the last year and a half has elicited more response than Mrs. Graham's plea for a newer and better logic in argumentation, in the November number of last year. True, some of the response has been by way of attack, and not a few of our readers have expressed doubt as to whether the teaching of argumentation was as badly off as Mrs. Graham seemed to think, and as to whether she was really offering anything new; but there can be no doubt that she started something. Consequently there will be general interest, we think, in the first article of this issue, in which Mrs. Graham attempts to explain more fully her advocacy of what she calls the "natural procedure" in argument. To some of us it may seem that the natural procedure in argument is merely our old friend Persuasion under another name; however that may be, the thing itself is here set forth more clearly and more definitely than in the earlier article. The Forum is open to those who feel called upon to express their reactions.

THE NEW BOOKS

IN general this is a miscellaneous number, but if there is any feature that stands out it is the unusually large number of book reviews—and this in spite of the fact that three or four of the reviews we expected have not arrived in time for publication. It has been a busy year in the publishing business. Perhaps a gradually widening circle of interests on the part of our contributors accounts for some of their increased activity as reviewers, or perhaps they are merely becoming more energetic; but with all proper allowance for both causes it is still evident that there is an actual increase in the number of books appearing in our field. Another sign of the times. But unless our review columns are to push the

rest of the magazine out through the covers we must again ask our contributors for shorter and more concise reviews.

We had particularly hoped to include in this issue several reviews of the *Course of Study for Secondary Schools;* several, in order to record opinions from both high schools and colleges, and from different sections of the country. Because of the inevitable delays of late September and early October we have not been able to assemble them in time, so they must be deferred until the February issue—which, by the way, will be edited in December, sent to press about January first, and published at the beginning, not the end, of February. At least we hope so. Since the *Course of Study* is in a sense an official publication of the ASSOCIATION, and is offered for public endorsement, we shall welcome opinions upon it from all quarters, though we cannot, of course, guarantee to publish all that are offered.

THE 1925 CONVENTION

A MESSAGE from the President appears elsewhere in these pages outlining the plans for the convention, which will be held at the Hotel McAlpin, New York City, on December 29, 30 and 31. A message to the Editor from Mr. Reeves adds the important information that reduced fares are again assured through the courtesy of the American Economic Association. Members should not fail to obtain certificates when purchasing their tickets, asking for them under the name of the American Economic Association. When properly validated at the convention these will entitle the holders to half-fare rates for the return journey.

THE FORUM

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir—The editors of the revised edition of *Modern Eloquence* have reprinted (Vol. X, p. 192) a speech entitled "Secession," which is attributed to Alexander H. Stephens. This speech was also included in G. P. Baker's *Forms of Public Address,* and here, too it was attributed to A. H. Stephens. The editorial note states that it was taken from B. J. Lossing's *Civil War in America,* Vol. 1, p. 178. In 1872, Alexander H. Stephens published *The Reviewers Reviewed,* and in article VIII he denounced the speech in question as a "forgery or gross fabrication from beginning to end." What Mr. Stephens authorized as his speeches against the secession of Georgia may be found in *The War Between the States,* by A. H. Stephens, Philadelphia, 1870, Vol. II, pp. 279-300 and 305-309.

My attention was called to some of these facts by Leonard L. Mackall's "Notes for Bibliophiles" in the section of the New York Herald Tribune entitled *Books* (November 9, 1924). As I have often used this speech in the classroom, I was interested in Mr. Mackall's assertion that this speech was a northern forgery, written for propagandist purposes. The evidence seems to prove his thesis conclusively. Teachers of rhetoric and public speaking may find an added interest in studying the speech as propaganda, but I hope we can do something toward correcting the injustice done to Mr. Stephens.

Very truly yours,

EVERETT L. HUNT,
Cornell University

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir—On May 12, 1925, the Chicago Tribune published the following editorial:

BOY ORATORS.

Before a jury including the chief justice of the Supreme court a number of young orators contended for prizes the other day and the highest award was in due time bestowed upon a lad of 15. The subject of youthful eloquence was the constitution of the United States, the virtues of which instrument were set forth with commendable warmth.

Presumably the adults responsible for the contest were impressed with its value, both to the contestants and the youth of the land, but doubts assail us. We doubt, for example, that it is profitable for a lad of 15 years to receive, not merely a substantial prize, but national advertisement and the honor of consideration by a jury including the chief justice of the Supreme court for an oration on a subject on which he cannot be expected at his age to have any original opinions; in fact, any opinions not borrowed from his elders. We doubt that it is good for him or for the youth of the land, or for their elders, to have so much honor paid to the pleasant vocalizing of borrowed truisms. It is to put a premium on mere talk, of which may we be permitted to remark, this republic has an overproduction.

Our ungracious opinion is that if the lads had debated the comparative merits of baseball and football, the merits and demerits of college societies, or any other question as to which their experience gave them data for their own independent thinking, they would have benefited more than by their excursion into the field of our constitutional law. What a democracy especially needs is respect for independent thinking, sincere thinking, and, if it can get it, original thinking. What it needs, perhaps even more, is suspicion of glib talk and the showy presentation of generalities, phrase making, and rhetoric.

I am sending this to the Forum section of the QUARTERLY because it seems to me a refreshingly sensible editorial attitude in regard to the national high school oratorical contests on the Constitution.

I trust that the attitude expressed in this editorial will get emphatic endorsement from the members of our NATIONAL ASSOCIATION. Perhaps it would be well for the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION to consider taking some action to discourage the exploiting of the widespread interest in speech education for propaganda and advertising purposes.

Very truly yours,

J. M. O'NEILL,
University of Wisconsin

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir—Professor Utterback's article, in the June issue, on Aristotle's contribution to the psychology of argument, moves me to submit a few counter-considerations. Mr. Utterback takes the position, not only that audience-analysis is important, but that it should be taught on equal terms with the analysis and organization of material, and that, to use his own words, "As no two audiences are quite alike, each speech must be made to order." Agreeing that audience-analysis is important, especially in the historical study of speeches, I cannot agree that it needs to be emphasized in courses in argumentation, nor that no two audiences are quite alike. To take up the last point first. Bryan delivered the same lectures all over the country, with no marked variation so far as I have heard, and with considerable success. Conwell's "Acres of Diamonds" is another example. Popular lectureres are constantly doing the same thing. I think I could dig up an article or two on the Chautauqua system in which it is said that lecturers are watched to insure their repeating *verbatim* the original lectures they submitted to the management. Even where minor changes are made, as in exordia, they will hardly outweigh the fact that the main line of appeal is found suitable for many audiences. One need not share Mencken's contempt for the *booboisie* to feel that the conceptual systems of the average American are much like that of his neighbor.

Mr. Utterback may draw support for the differences among audiences from Mr. Bauer's article (in the same issue) on Lincoln's adaptations to the local audience in his debates with Douglas; but that article does not tell us whether the subtle variations were minor or major, does not compare the changes with the consistent main line of argument, and does not indicate whether Douglas also shifted ground to meet local opinions. So we are not justified in calling the debates of 1858 examples of adaptation to distinctly different audiences, and certainly are not justified in considering these debates typical of audience-speaker relations.

Even though audiences do not vastly differ, it may still be urged that the study of a general audience should be included in a college course in argumentation, on the ground of "the equal importance of these two techniques" (the technique for the study of problems and the technique for the study of audiences). Peda-

gogically, the two techniques do not seem to me to be of equal importance. I should rate the study of subject as more fundamental than that of audiences and reserve detailed study of audience-adaptation to advanced courses.

To say that the two techniques are of equal importance is to say that the speaker's thinking-out of his subject is in a language foreign to his audience and to conclude that he must translate before he can be understood. Were that true, ordinary informal discussion would scarcely be possible, for that is often so impromptu as not to permit of adaptation. Yet we do talk, unpremeditatedly, and are understood. Human beings have an infinite variety, of course; but they are amazingly alike under the surface. Shakespeare made Shylock point that out, long before Kipling announced the similarity in the conceptual systems of Judith O'Grady and the colonel's lady. The lecturer and the lectured are sisters under the skin, too. Perhaps they are farthest apart if we take the words literally: the academic lecturer is often far removed from his audience; the lingo of his specialty is a foreign language to his students. But in the usual case, the intellectual disparity between audience and speaker is not so marked: the ideational systems of speaker and audience are not strangers to each other. And where audience and speaker think alike—have the same major premises, the same set of fundamental values—audience-analysis is not imperative.

Why then do speakers fail? Mr. Utterback suggests that they fail because they have not studied the audience. I suggest that they fail because they have not sufficiently studied the subject. Undergraduates in particular are fond of picking up a few ideas and a few formulas without really assimilating them into their own thought and their own language. This seems to me the most important reason for not introducing audience-analysis into courses and texts on argument. Much of the time in such courses has to be spent helping students to make up their own minds. Making up one's own judgment on public questions is never an easy process, and it is not much promoted for the undergraduate by the usual lecture-and-textbook course which makes up a large part of his mental fare. Hence it is an important function of a course in argument to teach students to master materials, to organize evidence, and to evaluate an inference. Though they are

sometimes pitted against each other in classroom debates, the real opponent of each is for a long time his own inability to handle and judge ideas. He will attend to the audience sufficiently if he makes an effort to be clear and interesting in his exposition of *his* ideas; but first and foremost he must have ideas in some depth and fulness and with some degree of organization. From insistence upon thoroughness and intellectual self-consistency will come a degree of flexibility and adaptability. By splitting attention between the needs of the subject and the supposed needs of the audience we run the danger not only of superficiality but of insincerity.

Very truly yours,

H. A. WICHELNS,

Cornell University

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir—It is of interest always to know what others are doing. I submit a brief statement of a rather pretentious debate program with the hope that someone who knows more about such things will tell me whether it was wise or foolish, and the further hope that others will tell of their experiments.

We assume that debating is primarily for the benefit of the students participating, and that the larger the number of participants the better; that it is neither a major sport, nor a species of mild warfare, nor an advertising agency, nor a means of accumulating school "victories"; but that it is rather an exercise in public discussion, intended to stimulate in the students an interest in public questions, and to give them a chance to match wits and exchange ideas with students from other schools.

With these ends in mind we scheduled fifteen inter-collegiate debates—with Oxford, Toronto, Penn State, Washington and Jefferson, Western Reserve, West Virginia (2), Swarthmore (2), Ohio State, George Washington, Georgetown, Colgate, Iowa State, and Boston. Eight were home debates. Perhaps the most unusual feature of this program was the fact that eight different questions were used, as follows: Congressional veto on unconstitutionality (3 times on each side), Philippine independence (2), child labor (2), the Geneva Protocol, commercialization of football, government interference with the individual, free speech, and foreign policy. Eleven of the teams were composed of men and four of

women. The total number of student speakers was 22. Only in one instance did the same team debate the same question more than once. Two students debated as many as four different questions. Two appeared in as many as five debates. No student debated on both sides of the same question. Less than half of the speakers had had college debating experience before this year.

Such a program suggests at once an excessive burden of coaching. We are fortunate in having for debate coaching an allowance of five hours through the year from one instructor's teaching time. This has made it possible to give considerable attention to the work, but we have not given more, I suspect, than is sometimes given to preparing two or three teams on a single question. The debaters have been left somewhat to their own devices, and so have developed considerable initiative and responsibility. Naturally their preparation has been at times superficial. This is regrettable, but I feel that, in general, they have not been conspicuously weaker than their opponents. All known types of debate contests have been tried—the "old line American," Oxford open forum, split teams—all of them, with all known means of rendering decisions, and occasionally a decisionless contest. About half of the judged debates were decided in our favor.

What lessons are to be drawn from such a season? I don't know. I would rather have someone else draw them. I have, however, a few observations. We have used too many questions; and the variety of questions has not helped appreciably to draw crowds to the home debates. We have used some weak speakers, which I do not regret. We have not accumulated a string of victories, which is cause for rejoicing, for the students' interest as they look forward to next season is not on winning decisions but on holding discussions. The fact that the university has not always been represented by its best talent is discounted by the fact that an unusually large number of students have received valuable training and experience.

Perhaps I should add that we are blessed with a yearly budget of $2100 and that we charged no admissions, not even to the Oxford debate

Very truly yours,

W. M. PARRISH,

University of Pittsburgh

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir—I suggest as the inevitable leading question for inter-collegiate debates in 1925-26: Resolved, That this house condemns the recent tendency toward the concentration of power and responsibility in the federal government.

Very truly yours,

W. M. PARRISH,
University of Pittsburgh

ASSOCIATION NEWS

THE NATIONAL CONVENTION

The National Convention will be held this year in the Hotel McAlpin, Broadway at 34th Street, New York City. The Hotel McAlpin has assured us of ample accommodations in the way of meeting rooms so that the entire convention will be held within the walls of this hotel.

Although the program is well along, it is too early at the date of this writing, September 12th, to give a detailed statement covering the various sessions. In general, the morning sessions will be devoted to matters of common interest to our members of the profession. The first morning, for instance, will be taken up with a discussion of American standards of pronunciation, the discussion being led by Mr. Windsor P. Daggett and by Professor Charles H. Woolbert. Time will be given for general discussion. On the second morning, Professor Thomas C. Trueblood of the University of Michigan will give a history of the teaching of public speaking in the United States. Certainly no one is better qualified to speak on this subject than is Professor Trueblood. On the third morning, some distinguished actor or critic will find a place on the program. There will be other papers in addition to those mentioned. The afternoon session will be broken up into at least three groups. There will be papers on different phases of argumentation and debating, particularly as related to class work. There will be papers on speech composition and rhetoric. There will be papers on interpretation and dramatics, and discussions and demonstrations in speech science, pathology and speech correction. Mrs. E. W. Scripture has promised a discussion and a demonstration at her clinic. Professors Hill of the Kansas "Aggies," Ewbank of Albion College, Cabel of Iowa, Sandford of Ohio State, and Layton of Muskingum College, are among those who will appear. Invitations have been extended to several people in the East, but I have not been able to get word from them as yet.

I am planning to allow more than the usual time for discussion. Copies of the program will be mailed to the membership in ample time, and it is hoped that each member who plans to attend will look over the program, pick out what seems most interesting to him, and formulate his ideas for discussion.

The hour 9:00-9:45 each morning will be given over to visiting, committee meetings and conferences. Experience teaches that there will be about so much visiting any way, so we have decided to give it a place on the program. At 12:30 each day there will be a luncheon at the Hotel McAlpin. Those who remember the enthusiasm which attended the luncheons last year will plan their engagements so as not to miss one of these luncheons. Mrs. Perle Shale Kingsley and Mr. Harry B. Gough have been invited to continue their happy offices as hostess and host. Something out of the ordinary may be looked for in connection with these luncheons.

Sometime during the three days there will be held a conference of teachers in universities and colleges granting at least the M. A. degree in speech. Problems incidental to graduate work will be thoroughly discussed.

It is confidently expected that special rates will be made by the railroads for this convention.

It is expected that this will be the biggest and best convention of our history so far. For more than ten years, we have been growing and developing in our professional relations. During the past few years we have developed an unprecedented friendliness and morale. The National Convention is the only time in the year when we can all get together, discuss our problems, and promote our friendly relations. Let us all make every effort to be present at this convention! New York City is the place—December 29, 30, and 31st. is the time. SEE YOU THERE!

R. K. IMMEL, *President.*
University of Southern California.

BELATED APOLOGY

In my "message" in the April issue of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL I spoke of graduate work for the Ph.D degree, mentioning Iowa and Wisconsin in particular as granting these degrees in Speech. I inadvertently omitted Cornell University from this list.

In justice to Cornell, I take this rather late opportunity of correcting this omission.

(Signed): R. K. IMMEL.

(This reached the editorial office just too late for the June issue. ED.)

NEW BOOKS

Better-Speech Year: a Bulletin of Speech Education for Teachers in Secondary Schools. GLENN N. MERRY, Editor. National Council of Teachers of English, 506 West 69th Street, Chicago. 1924. 67 pp.

This pamphlet was produced under the supervision of the Joint committee on American Speech, of which Professor Merry was Chairman. The committee was composed of three members from the National Council of Teachers of English, three from the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH, and three from the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The chief credit for this helpful compilation must go to Professor Merry. One cannot read the table of contents without being impressed with his success in securing contributions from writers who are not only specialists but authorities in the subjects they discuss. It would be rather useless, and certainly impossible for the reviewer at the time he is called upon, to discuss fully the papers in the pamphlet. A few comments must suffice.

The articles have been written chiefly for those teachers who have to take up work in the field without elaborate special preparation, but will be of interest and profit to all teachers of spoken English, public speaking, dramatics, or "speech," whether in school or college. No one should go to any compilation of this sort with the expectation that he can gain from such brief articles a sufficient understanding of the topics treated; but he can hope to gain many helpful suggestions, a clearer view of the general field, and some insight into what a teacher of limited training may wisely attempt to do and what he should let alone. Perhaps the article which suffers least from its brevity is that by C. H. Woolbert on "Improving Action," which is a gem of condensed completeness.

The hardest of subjects to treat on paper is the one the Editor took up himself, "Improving the Voice." It is a subject that must be learned mostly face to face with the teacher. If those of

small training are a bit confused by learning on p. 10 that "quality refers to the general nature of the voice which enables us to distinguish one voice from another," and on p. 14 that speech sounds, such as *ee, oo,* and *ah,* are qualities of voice, he may assume that all would be clear with more elaboration, and turn his attention to learning from this experienced master of a most tangled subject what is to be done, and in particular what one not a specialist may attempt.

One may be grateful for the brief statement concerning "Speech Disorders," by Dr. Smiley Blanton, the leading authority in the field, without being led to suppose its perusal will fit one to deal with the defects discussed. This article should serve a most useful purpose in showing the unitiated how many erroneous notions there are abroad, how much quackery has been practiced on unfortunates, and how wise it is for most of us to let speech disorders alone.

In A. M. Drummond's article on "Dramatics and Speech Training" we have another statement by a master of exceptional experience and intelligence. Without pretense of completeness, it is packed full of helpful suggestions and presents sound views of the place and purposes of dramatics in the educational scheme.

W. W. Hatfield, Editor of the *English Journal,* and C. C. Certain of the Detroit Public Schools, have the advantage of being in close touch with secondary school work. In "Speech as Communication" Professor Hatfield stresses a most wholesome idea which receives much attention throughout this pamphlet. Strange that so obvious an idea should need stress, that not so many years ago the thought imbedded in the term *communication* was quite commonly overlooked; but it is the common failing of those who become engrossed in technique, good or bad, to overlook the obvious truths.

Professor Hatfield's other article, on "Improving Language," has practical suggestions that will be welcomed; but one suspects that the pages which will be most worn by teachers looking for usable hints will be those containing the latter part of Professor Certain's article on "Speech Improvement as a Problem of Socialization," with the many programs for auditorium work.

No one should take these articles for gospel. We have not arrived at final truth in our field, and if we had it could not be

told so briefly. We recognize too that in any work of this sort each writer is bound to ride his hobbies a bit. Nevertheless we may safely say that it would be difficult indeed to bring together another group who would speak as wisely and authoritatively as the writers of *Better Speech Year*. One hopes it will not be overlooked because it is bound to be overshadowed by the recent report of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH, *Speech Training and Public Speaking for Secondary Schools*, with its large number of articles and its permanent book form.

J. A. WINANS, *Dartmouth College.*

Edward Everett, Orator and Statesman. BY PAUL REVERE FROTHINGHAM. Boston and New York. Houghton Mifflin Company. 1925. pp. 495.

This biography, the first on this subject, will do much to establish or re-establish Everett as one of America's supreme orators. Many significant quotations from Everett's private journal illuminate the book. Both statesman and orator are treated with reasonable fullness. A number of speeches, as "The Character of Washington," are analyzed and quoted at length. One of the fifteen chapters is especially given to a discussion of Everett's oratory. A number of chapter headings, such as "Pegagus in the Pulpit," "Port after Stormy Seas," "Apollo in Politics," and "With the God of Battles," suggest a stilted style which fortunately the author avoids.

One gets the impression of Everett as a brilliant and scholarly personality, industrious, patriotic, conservative, sensitive, shy, formal, at the bottom deeply religious, troubled always by a silent Berserkir restlessness. He is always trying, evidently with only partial success, to move amid or master the cultural pioneerism and the growing political chaos of his day. Such is the significance of the man as Harvard undergraduate, youthful Battle Street minister, wanderer in Europe, professor of Greek at Harvard, editor of the North American Review, Congressman, Governor of Massachusetts, President of Harvard, Secretary of State, Senator at Washington.

These qualities of character and these experiences are echoed in the speeches. But if Everett the publicist and patriot never

quite found himself, did Everett the orator do so? Frothingham presents much contemporary testimony and much reasoning to justify his contention that few American public speakers have so moved and inspired audiences as did Everett.

The biographer meets the traditional criticisms that Everett was over-elaborate, artificial, and addicted to the memoriter methods. His rhetoric, the author agrees, was of the Eighteenth Century school. His "besetting sin was magniloquence." He abounded in ornament, simile, climaxes. Gradually, however, the grand manner gave place to simplicity. "Great Issues Now Before the Country," the New York address of July 4, 1861, was free from these rhetorical mannerisms. On this occasion he was "as simple now as truth itself; as direct and forcible as fate. . . . At last he was swept off his feet and carried away by a great emotion. For the first time in his life he was a Michelangelo as well as a Raphael of speech." Everett's long series of platform addresses, political, didactic, literary, eulogistic, occasional, from 1811 to 1865, thus present not only a commentary upon contemporary thought and feeling, but upon the gradual evolution of rhetorical style.

Frothingham defends Everett's studied material. Careful preparation rather than reliance upon chance the author believes is sound forensic procedure. In working everything out Everett was "essentially Greek." As for the complaint that matter and manner were finished and graceful, the biographer replies that it was just as natural for Everett to be graceful and finished as for other people to be awkward. Such objections, the book contends, are like objecting to a person because his eyes are "too bright or his hands too delicately formed. These things were parts of himself and only to be changed by an artificial cultivation of hesitance and seeming forgetfulness." The biographer finds that as time went on, the orator, although keeping up his patient methods of preparation, yet was careful to "give himself more freedom and to develop spontaneity of expression." A number of specific examples are given to prove Everett's power in extempore speech. The Gettysburg Oration was a "great oration, nobly conceived, and worthy of Everett at his best, although he was now on the verge of seventy." In comparing this speech with Lincoln's the author notes that Everett's "was much the harder and more exacting task," and that posterity has forgotten that Everett here "was the first to sound

the note of reconciliation between North and South." And forthwith the writer proceeds to an analysis of the speech to demonstrate its power. Thus the biography becomes a long-needed apologia. It is a definite contribution to the history of American oratory. It will lead, we hope, to the publication of a convenient one-volume edition of Everett's speeches.

A. CRAIG BAIRD, *University of Iowa.*

Edmund Burke; A Historical Study. BY JOHN MORLEY. New York. Alfred A. Knopf. 1924. 255 pages.

Students of Burke, and all lovers of books will welcome this admirable reprint of Viscount Morley's critical study of the life and policies of Edmund Burke. The essay, first published in London in 1867, has long been out of print, although it has always been eagerly sought for and read. It is gratifying that a work so rare is once more available. It affords one additional pleasure to comment upon the technical workmanship of this new edition from the press of Alfred A. Knopf, for the printing and the paper are a special delight.

One recalls that after his graduation from Oxford, Morley studied law and was called to the bar, but he never practised. He spent some seven or eight years in London, enjoying the varied experiences of a journalist and gaining some insight into the literary life of the British capital. Then in 1867, he obtained widespread recognition and unstinted critical favor by publishing his first book, *Burke; A Historical Study.* It showed his interest both in literature and politics, as well as being his first tangible tribute to his master; for Morley tells us that Burke had been his high idol as a young man, and we know that he continued to be one of the potent forces throughout his life. Morley admired Burke as a statesman and political philosopher, and his was not a silent appreciation. We have the *Historical Study,* which is the subject of this review; again, there is the biographical estimate of Burke, (English Men of Letters, New York, 1879); while in his *Indian Speeches* (London, 1909), and scattered throughout the two volumes of his *Recollections* (New York, 1917), Lord Morley gives us passages too numerous to record, which support his belief that Burke was "one of the greatest of men" (*Recollections, 2:264*).

And at the close of his life, this distinguished statesman of the Victorian era is free to confess that he learned more from Burke than from any other source on practical principles in the strategy and tactics of public life. "When I count how little of the debt could ever be paid, I feel as if a fairly creditable stonecutter should presume to talk of what he owed to Michelangelo. Well might Macaulay exclaim, 'the greatest man since Milton.'" (*Recollections, 1:81-82*).

Burke; A Historical Study, may not represent fully Lord Morley's mature views on this subject; still, there are few essayists who have given us a more stimulating and informing approximation of the truth about this political philosopher of the eighteenth century. Morley makes clear that Burke's teachings and actions were controlled by a firm belief in a doctrine of plain common-sense; that the man who meddles with action must consider consequence, balance probabilities, estimate forces, choose the lesser evil, courageously acquiescing in the fact that things in politics are apt to turn out second best. Here are some of the problems considered: Characteristics; Issues of the Time; the Constitution; American Independence; Economical Reform, Ireland and India; and the French Revolution. It is apparent that Burke believed in the Walpolian traditions of religious toleration, public liberty, financial reform, and an indulgent colonial policy. He was a practical politician, he taught that true statesmanship must often prefer expediency to principle. Burke saw society as a naturally evolved state, an organic growth, which corrected itself; for Burke society was not a human invention, rather it corrected itself and was disordered by human interference. In this essay, Morley frees Burke of the charge of inconsistency. Burke was always opposed to reform in the cheap and popular interpretation of the term. Here one cannot refrain from quoting Burke's own words: "It cannot be repeated too often, line upon line, precept upon precept, until it comes into the currency of a proverb, *To innovate is not to Reform.*"

This study of Burke should give Morley a place among English philosophers, for there is the philosophical tone about it; it is characterized by a warm appreciation of Burke's political philosophy; every chapter suggests a search for the fundamental principles of Burke's public policy. For the student who wishes to catch

a glimpse of the workings of Burke's mind in relation to the stirring events of his time, one knows of no finer essay than this; and the teacher who is called upon to impart some knowledge of Burke's speeches, should see that this *Historical Study* is made available in the school or university library, for it represents the political philosophy underlying Burke's speeches and guiding his public career; it is a study of the mind of the orator.

In his *Letter to a Noble Lord,* Burke wrote: "It was my aim to give to the people the substance of what I knew they most desired, and what I thought was right, whether they desired it or not; and this must ever be the best maxim of statesmanship among a free people." It is interesting here to read a passage from one of Lord Morley's own speeches; it was in one of his most eloquent moments that he declared the central purpose of his life to be "to make more men happy, and happy in a better way."

ROBERT HANNAH, *Cornell University.*

M. Fabii Quintiliani, Institutionis Oratoriae, Liber I, Edited with Introduction and Commentary. BY F. H. COLSON. Cambridge, 1924.

Lucian, with an English translation. BY A. H. HARMON. Vol. IV. Loeb Classical Library. New York. Putnam's, 1925.

A Study in Alcidamas and his Relation to Contemporary Sophistic. BY MARJORIE J. MILNE. Bryn Mawr, 1924.

St. Augustine, the Orator, a study of the rhetorical qualities of St. Augustine's *Sermones ad Populum.* BY SISTER M. INVIOLATA BARRY. The Catholic University of America, 1924.

Professor Colson has made a distinct contribution to the meagre literature on Quintilian. He had intended to include a translation with his edition of the first book, but the publication of a translation by Professor H. E. Butler in the Loeb series led him to change his plans. The introduction of ninety-three pages, however, contains much valuable material that cannot easily be obtained elsewhere. Among the topics treated are the educational system of Quintilian's time and his relations to it, Quintilian's educational principles, the *Institutio* regarded as a treatise on rhetoric, and the history of the knowledge and use of Quintilian.

The most famous of ancient satires upon the practices of the professional rhetoricians is found in one of the dialogues of Lucian.

The thorough-going methods of Quintilian had gone out of favor under the Antonines, and the tricks by which an audience could be amused were quickly taught. The supposed advice of a teacher to an aspirant for rhetorical reputation is what Lucian gives us by way of denunciation of a profession to which he once expected to belong. H. W. and F. G. Fowler, in their earlier translation of Lucian (Oxford 1905), translate the title of the dialogue as "The Rhetorician's *Vade Mecum.*" Professor Harmon modernizes it into "A Professor of Public Speaking." In both translations modern English equivalents have been sought rather than an exact literalness, and it is hard to say which version is preferable.

In the *Classical Weekly* for January 20, 1919, Professor La Rue Van Hook gives an account of the quarrel between Alcidamas and Isocrates over the relative advantages of speaking and writing. He appends to his interesting article a translation of the speech of Alcidamas, *On the Writers of Written Discourses.* It has a modern sound, and compares speaking and writing somewhat after the fashion of Professor Woolbert. Professor Van Hook calls attention in a footnote to a remarkable resemblance between the passage which compares written speeches with statues and pictures, and a similar passage in Plato's *Phaedrus* (275d), but he dismisses the comparison with a citation to the effect that Alcidamas did not know Plato. Apparently there was no suspicion that Plato might have borrowed from the sophist. Miss Milne's thesis, however, shows that the speech of Alcidamas *On the Writers of Written Discourse* is earlier than the *Phaedrus,* and it there quoted to a greater extent than had been suspected even by upholders of its priority. Other conclusions of interest are tha Alcidamas is the sophist attacked by Isocrates in *Against the Sophists,* XIII, 9; and that Anaximenes, to whom the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* is generally attributed, was indebted to Alcidamas for significant parts of his rhetorical theory.

While noting Miss Milne's thesis, mention should be made of two Bryn Mawr publications of major importance in the field of classical rhetoric. In 1922 Professor W. C. Wright published in the Loeb series a translation of *The Lives of the Sophists,* by Philostratus and Eunapius, and in 1923 appeared his three-volume translation of *The Works of the Emperor Julian.*

Sister Inviolata Barry's dissertation is the sixth volume of the

Patristic Studies published under the direction of Professor Roy J. Deferrari, by the Catholic University of America. The writers of these studies have thoroughly acquainted themselves with ancient rhetorical theory, and have then examined the sermons of the church fathers in order to determine accurately the extent of the influence of pagan rhetoric upon the early preachers. This influence has long been noted, but it has not been studied in "scholarly" fashion until the last quarter century. Edwin Hatch's chapter upon the subject in his Hibbert Lectures for 1888 was chiefly concerned to show the evil effects of rhetoric in the pulpit. In 1901 M. Puech, of the University of Paris, reviewed the increasing literature upon the writings of the church fathers ("La Littérature grecque chrétienne," *Revue de synthèse historique,* June 1901) and proposed the question of the indebtedness of patristic eloquence to the contemporary sophistic. Since then three notable theses have been written under his direction: Meridier, *L'Influence de la seconde Sophistique sur l'oeuvre de Gregoire de Nysse,* Paris, 1906 Guignet, *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze et la Rhétorique,* Paris, 1911; and Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide et la Sophsitique dans la Province D'Asie au IIe siècle de notre ére,* Paris, 1923. None of these theses employs the statistical method of investigation, and M. Guignet (p. 12) argues against the method for patristic studies. The studies published by the Catholic University, however, are in the main statistical, and J. M. Campbell in the preface to his work, *The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of St. Basil the Great,* states the case for statistical analysis. In addition to their value to students of the second sophistic and of patriotic eloquence, these studies suggest a method of approach to other orators in other periods. The Aristotelian is likely to feel that such studies as these neglect the first two books of the *Rhetoric* for the third, and that there is much more to the rhetorical study of an orator than an analysis and tabulation of qualities of style. Until rhetoricians have developed an investigative uethod of their own, however, they must be content with the findings of students whose primary interests are in other fields.

EVERETT L. HUNT, *Cornell University.*

Euphon English in America. By M. E. DeWitt. E. P. Dutton and Co. Pp. xviii + 176.

This book is primarily a plea for the acceptance of what the author chooses to style World Standard English in America, including the United States and Canada. The nature of this standard remains conjectural in the first part of the book, which is dedicated to the conversion of those who hold that no single standard is desirable, but is sufficiently revealed in the second part, which consists of phonetic transcriptions and notes of the speech of 37 people, including the author.

Unfortunately, the first part is marred by several digressions into politics, social problems, and kindred irrelevancies, and by lack of organization. The phonetic passages, which with their notes comprise the second part, are conveniently arranged, have been transcribed with considerable "narrowness" of detail, and are presumably accurate records. The alphabet is substantially that of the International Phonetic Association, though one might question the propriety of using the same symbol for the vowel in *bed* and the first vowel in *day,* and using a separate symbol for the first vowel in *air.*

The "standard" indicated by the passages would seem to be rather less widely accepted than a standard should be. The local origin of those whose speech is recorded is sufficiently representative of the country at large, but it seems from Miss DeWitt's notes that a number of them, though born elsewhere, have been strongly influenced by the speech of New England. The frequent preference for the first vowel in *father* instead of the vowel in *hat,* and the positive horror at "inversion" are especially noteworthy. One is reminded that juries differ, and that in spite of several formidable names on Miss DeWitt's list a somewhat different "standard" might be indicated by an equally competent transcription of some other group of speakers.

One regrets that, save for a passing comment in one of the transcriptions, no mention is made of Professor Krapp's excellent *Pronunciation of Standard English in America,* and that Professor J. S. Kenyon's *American Pronunciation* was published too recently to be of service to Miss DeWitt. Both of these books emphasize the difficulty of attempting to force acceptance of a single standard throughout the country, and recommend a more

tolerant attitude toward the problem than is shown in *Euphon English.*

C. K. THOMAS, *Cornell University.*

American Pronunciation. A text-book of phonetics for students in English. By JOHN SAMUEL KENYON. George Wahr, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1924. Pp. vii & 200.

The very much unsettled matter known as the "problem of pronunciation" waits on the evidence. When the evidence is all in, as it seems likely never to be, the advocates will find that there is no judge and too large a jury, and everybody will keep on pronouncing as merrily as ever. In the meantime the advocates vigorously advocate and some of them, setting up to be judges, render sweeping decisions with a show of authority.

A full comprehension of the situation requires acquaintance with the advocates of widely different systems or styles. Unfortunately the recent impetus given to the study of phonetics in connection with the English language has so definitely centered in the South of England that far the greater number of books on English pronunciation may almost be classed as propaganda for the particular variety of English in use in that region. It is called by various names, but is always essentially a class or regional dialect, perhaps the best, assuredly not the universal, speech of educated Englishmen.

Even in England there is much opposition to the doctrine of the superiority of this "Received Standard English." In this country there is, *a fortiori,* more reason to object to any attempt to set up that dialect as the standard for our speech—which is exactly what is being done by altogether too many of our writers on pronunciation. In his preface Professor Kenyon says he believes "that the state of cultivated pronunciation in America does not warrant the dogmatism found, for example, in the work of Mr. Daniel Jones and Mr. Walter Ripman with reference to standard pronunciation in England," and he might fully as justifiably have added the names of some Americans. Professor Kenyon's book is limited to one form of pronunciation: the cultivated pronunciation of his own locality—the Western Reserve of Ohio. Therein lies one of its chief merits. At last we have a book, with cloth covers and an ambitious title, that flies in the face of the

majority and calls American a style of pronunciation which does not ape, even at a great distance, the English. We may or may not concur in his belief that this style "is fairly representative of what will here be called the speech of the North, which is virtually uniform in its most noticeable features from New York west, in the region north of a line drawn west from Philadelphia," but we must be thankful for his having recorded that speech as it is. If we do not like his kind of speech, we find comfort in the statement that "There is no intention of implying any preference for this speech over that of the East or South." There is evidence of an effort to point out the differences of different parts of the country, so that the book is more generally useful than many others.

There are a few statements that might be questioned: *e. g.*, "The tongue positions for some of the vowels are different in England from what they are in America" is not a scientific statement; it should be made clear that the phonetic symbols involved are used to represent the different sounds in the two countries, not suggested that identical sounds are made in different ways. The symbols which Mr. Kenyon seems to find it necessary to add to those of the International Phonetic Association may be advisable; but they do not appear to be in accord with the policy of uniformity which, perhaps more than any other factor, has facilitated the advance of phonetics in recent years. There can be no good reason for his using as the mark of a syllabic consonant the sign which has for years been and still is in general use to indicate inversion, especially when there is a recognized sign for the syllabic consonant. The placing of the mark of accentuation after instead of before the accented syllable is a step backwards, opposed to the sensible and well-nigh universal practice of phoneticians in this country as abroad, an unwarranted concession to the method employed in dictionaries only because it is popular. The reviewer is inclined to feel that the advice, "Learn the key-word with the symbol," is pernicious pedagogical doctrine. The key-word is at best a makeshift and an uncertain shortcut for the beginner and always gets in the way of the immediate and accurate recognition of sounds; but that may be a matter of opinion.

All these shortcomings, as well as the feeble treatment of assimilation, the ignoring of intonation, and the dearth of passages in phonetic transcription, are more than compensated by the excel-

lent section on "gradation" and "strong and weak forms." This phenomenon of all language, perhaps more characteristic of English than of others and perhaps quite different in America from what it is in England, is here treated more fully, more clearly, and with more illustrative material than in any other work which has come to the reviewer's attention. These fifteen pages constitute an invaluable contribution to the science of phonetics in America, and make the book worth while independently of its other virtues.

In the preface to his most recent work on English phonetics, in which he uses the pronunciation of the South of England, Daniel Jones writes: "Many other kinds of pronunciation exist and it is to be hoped that those who are able to give accurate descriptions of other forms will bring out books similar to this one . . ., and English people will be better able to tackle the difficult problem of what is standard pronunciation." Professor Kenyon's *American Pronunciation* is such a book. We may disagree with the absolute worth of the pronunciation recorded therein, may say we never heard of such abuses of dictionary traditions, may earnestly desire an importation of the habits of speech of Eton and Harrow, but we cannot fail to recognize that any widespread understanding of the speech of this country and the orthoëpic equilibrium necessary for a fair and scientific approach to our phonetic material require such books as this from the Middle West, the Far West, and the South, as well as from the country east of the Hudson River, which has hitherto almost monopolized the field.

LEE S. HULTZEN, *Washington University*

Public Speaking for Business Men. By SIDNEY F. WICKS. Frederick A. Stokes Co., New York. 1925. Printed in England.

Not nearly so bad as the title suggests. One expects, of course, the correspondence school sort of thing, for the special delectation of those who would emulate George F. Babbitt. Instead one finds a readable book by an author who is both a public speaker and a teacher of public speaking, and who is generally sound without being academic. He is English—which may explain why the book does not live up to the American connotations of its title.

In the judgment of Mr. Wicks, the chief needs of the public speaker are:

1. To overcome self-consciousness, so that he may give himself to his audience without fear.
2. To cultivate a strong, pure, pleasing voice.
3. To discipline his body to aid his spoken word.
4. To give to his speeches a fundamental architecture.
5. To be logical and to reverence truth.
6. To speak the English language with knowledge, simplicity, and force.
7. To have something worthy to say; to say it with economy of means; to have the courage of his convictions.

All these are quite familiar to the American teacher, but the author's way of developing his topic is refreshingly different from anything to be found in an American textbook. There are odd bits of philosophy, picturesque allusions and figures of speech, and entertaining illustrative examples; there is a treatment of speech composition quite off the beaten path; and there are individual points of view on all the topics discussed.

The weakest section of the book is that on the English language, which is not surprising; the English are naturally less self-conscious about the language than we are and consequently more at sea when they come to discuss it.

If for no other reason than the fact that it is so different the American teacher of public speaking should peruse this book.

JOHN DOLMAN, JR., *University of Pennsylvania*

Short Plays from American History and Literature. For Classroom Use. By OLIVE M. PRICE. New York. Samuel French. 1925.

The best thing the reviewer can say for this volume is that he is reviewing it; he had intended to send it to the proper Assistant Editor, but his children got hold of it and liked it so well that they insisted upon keeping the review copy in the family.

The plays are the outgrowth of the author's work in the Pittsburgh public schools, and are used in the classrooms of that city. They are endorsed, in an enthusiastic preface, by Dr. William M. Dividson, Superintendent of Schools.

The subjects include a story of persecution for witchcraft in early New England, a dramatization of Evangeline, one of Hiawatha, an incident at Mount Vernon, a version of the Pocahontas

story, and several others. While not free of the stiffness that seems inevitable in plays written for children, these are a little more human and more convincing than most. The dramatization of Evangeline seems least effective; the metrical form is lyric, not dramatic, and as drama it is artificial. The Pocahontas play, supposedly in prose, has more of the sort of rhythm that seems to belong in drama, and is much less strained. Dramatically, the witchcraft play is probably the best, despite the rather obvious bias in favor of the Quakers and against the Puritans.

But some one ought to review these plays after trying them out in the classroom.

JOHN DOLMAN, JR., *University of Pennsylvania*

The Public Life. By J. A. SPENDER. New York. Stokes. 1925.

The psychology of audiences, we read in Professor Utterback's article in the last issue of THE JOURNAL, is a neglected phase of the teaching of argument. The reviewer would qualify that statement, but is quite willing to advance another and broader thesis in line with it: The conditions under which speeches are made are too often forgotten by critics and teachers of public speaking. For a full understanding of the oratory of a period, we require a wide and deep knowledge of the varying life of society throughout that period. Yet there are not many books on the social background of public speaking. Here and there one finds useful passages in a history; here and there a stray essay such as Jebb's; sometimes a hint is found in sociological works or in studies of public opinion such as those of Wallas and Lippman; more often, perhaps, the biographies of public men hold something of interest—Morley's *Gladstone,* Trevelyan's *Bright,* Cole's *Cobbett,* are instances. But Spender's book is the only one known to the reviewer which is in effect a serious inquiry into the conditions under which men lead the public life. It is confined to the political sphere. The clergyman, the lecturer, the writer, all share with the politician in the public life; but Spender's own interests and duties as editor of an old-line liberal paper in London naturally have confined his observations to the political, the parliamentary sphere. Though thus restricted, the book necessarily goes beyond the conditions of public speaking: there is much about the political arts of cabinet-making, of handling foreign affairs, of dealing with the press. But

the arts of public speaking, of political manipulation, and of public address through the press, are so interwoven that they can be understood only if they are taken together. It is the merit of Spender's book that it does take them together.

The first volume begins with a sketch of English political life in the eighteenth century, with its corruption, its restriction of power to the landed gentry, and its hints of the latent power of the middle classes who were the source of Pitt's strength. It proceeds to an account of the outstanding figures of the nineteenth century: Palmerston, with his instinct for appealing to one powerful British quality—pugnacity; Gladstone, with his appeal to the conscience of the nation; Bright and Cobden, the tribunes of the people, who refused the responsibilities of the politician and wrought their effect on public opinion by speech and pamphlet; Joseph Chamberlain, the consummate debater, whose campaign of 1885 Spender thinks the best he ever witnessed in respect of the clarity and force with which the leader set forth his ideas. The survey goes on, including the figures of the Great War, but is a little too guarded on these. Of the greatest interest, perhaps, is the chapter on the art and craft of the M. P., in which the combination of the art of speech with the art of political management and with statesmanship is plainly set forth.

In his second volume, Mr. Spender considers some general problems presented by his long experience as an observer of political life: Democracy and government, the press and the public life, the ideas of the public man. The first two subjects are well handled. Mr. Spender is keenly aware of the changed conditions of politics and of political speaking brought about by the growth of democracy and the parallel growth in power of the press. But his chapters on the ideas of the public man are less worth while. He has not struck a balance between the public man's ideas as a human being, a private citizen, and those which he has and uses in his public character. Had the author, for example, taken a leaf from Bagehot, whom he quotes earlier in the work, and dealt with that writer's phrases about unseasonable originality in public men, and about men of first-rate capacities and second-rate ideas, he might have made this section more interesting and more searching. For the public man is a popularizer of ideas rather than an inventor; many of the journalistic reproaches against public

speaking originate in the feeling that he ought to be an inventor; the recognition of popularization as a function essential in a democracy would do much to clarify thinking about the worth of public address. This Spender puts well in an earlier passage that deserves quotation:

"Englishmen make a serious mistake in laughing at systematic attempts to teach what in other countries is called 'rhetoric'; and now that the door into the public life lies wide open to all comers, one may hope that it will in time be a regular part of the curriculum of education. Rhetoric includes not merely the use of words, but the qualities of mind that make for self-possession and effectiveness in a speaker and enable him to develop an argument in an orderly and lucid way. A man who has had 'rhetoric' instilled into him in youth will be in little danger of becoming either a wind-bag or a demagogue in later years."

It is gratifying to find a careful dispassionate, and scholarly student of public affairs who recognizes the function of public address and the need of training in it. Even more gratifying, because less common, is it to find a student of public affairs with the wide grasp and the realistic temper displayed in these two volumes.

H. A. WICHELNS, *Cornell University*

IN THE PERIODICALS

ARTICLES REVIEWED

DEWEY, JOHN, *Logical Method in Law.* The Cornell Law Quarterly, Vol. X, pp. 17-28, December, 1924.

To those interested in the question of the application of logic to argument Mr. Dewey's article is recommended. True, this is a discussion of logical method in its relation to law, but many parts of its analysis are equally of interest to students of public speaking. There is, for example, considerable food for thought in Dewey's pragmatic definition of logic and his discussion of the genesis of its rules—usually considered so far removed from practice—as involving "a kind of natural selection of the methods which afford the best type of conclusion, better for subsequent uses, just as happens in the development of rules for conducting any art."

Of particular interest, too, is the treatment of a specific instance (that of Justice Holmes) of the widespread condemnation of logic as applied to practical affairs. The chief source of this criticism is found to be the unjustifiable tendency to hold logic "as equivalent with the syllogism." Upon this identification and the "orthodox tradition" with which it accords, Mr. Dewey centers his rebuttal fire. The effect upon law of the reign of the syllogism alone is clearly shown. The constructive case is for "the need of another kind of logic." Holding that "there are different logics in use," Mr. Dewey discusses the logic of exposition and points the need of "a logic of prediction of possibilities." The final plea is for "the infiltration into law of a more experimental and flexible logic."

The article is error-dispelling, stimulating. Certainly it should be worth while for the teacher of argument to "tune in" while one of the outstanding logicians of our time discusses the relation of logic to a not too distant field.

G. M. G.

COHEN, MORRIS R., *The Insurgence Against Reason,* and *The Rivals and Substitutes for Reason.* Journal of Philosophy, Vol. XXII, No. 5, and No. 6, 1925.

What ever else argument may be or become, it must at least purport to be an expression of reasoning. Its function is to give reasons for a stand taken, it is preëminently rational, and it is because this is true that the teacher of argument should find of very real interest the two articles here noted. Mr. Cohen holds that "Despite the frequent assertion that ours is an age of science, we are witnessing today a remarkably widespread decline of the prestige of intellect and reason," and that "The decline of the avowed faith in reason is one of the central facts of recent intellectual history."

The second article in the series deals with the claims of one of the most outstanding rivals of reason, authority. There is consideration of the cause of the prestige of authority, with an analysis of the authoritarian as over against the reformer and revolutionist; there is clear-cut analysis of the main sources of authority to which one is asked to submit: (1) The Church, (2) the appeal to traditional belief, (3) the authority of the superior or more competent. Here is a subject with which argumentation is very directly concerned. Upon the latter two sources of authority, sometimes even upon the first, current argument is constantly based. What of such a use of authority? Is it "opposed to reason?" Mr. Cohen's interesting and keenly upheld conclusion is that we cannot dispense with *all* authority, "yet rationalism . . . remains justified." The important distinction drawn is between authority with its proper use determined by reason and a non-rational authoritarianism.

The articles are not always easy reading but they distinctly reward the effort. G. M. G.

BRIDGES, ROBERT, *Poetry in Schools.* Society for Pure English Tract No. XVIII. Oxford University Press, 1924.

The Society for Pure English has been publishing since 1921 a series of "tracts" dealing with various questions concerning diction, especially good usage, in written and spoken English. Beside containing the short paper by Robert Bridges, the eighteenth tract offers a discussion of "Subjunctives" by H. W. Fowler, and

an "open court," contributed to by four writers, upon admitting "alright" into good usage. Among the back numbers of these tracts, No. IV, *The Pronunciation of English Words Derived from the Latin,* and No. V, *The Englishing of French Words,* should be of special interest to teachers of speechcraft. All publications of the society can be obtained from the Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York City; the price of any of the tracts mentioned is eighty-five cents. Persons who wish to learn more of the Society for Pure English are referred to Henry Seidel Canby as American representative. H. H. H.

FENTON, H. J., *After-Dinner Speaking,* Educational Review, LXIX, 5, p. 249. May, 1925.

Professor Fenton explains his procedure in teaching after-dinner speaking at the United States Naval Academy. He stresses the importance of this kind of instruction, and suggests that this procedure, which involves the assembling of the class at an actual dinner-table, can be applied in any institution where the students eat in a common dining hall; he also makes suggestions for its use in other institutions. H. H. H.

PARRISH, W. M., *A Technique in Higher Education,* Educational Review, LXIX, 5, p. 225. May, 1925.

After some mordant criticisms of the lecture method and the recitation method, as used in college teaching, the author suggests as a technique especially suited to the teaching of the social sciences, literature, and public speaking, the method "already being used in its essentials in several different schools," wherein stimulating readings upon pertinent questions are assigned and used as the basis of original speaking and writing by the student. Professor Parrish expresses small hope, however, of the adoption of this technique. "Administrative officers will prefer the old way," he concludes. "It is cheaper. And as the deans will go on deaning, doubtless the professors will go on professing—from the lecture rostrum; because academic dignity is precious. But if they do, mark this dire prophecy: the students will go on sleeping. And he who is not awakened in his youth sleeps on forever."

H. H. H.

THOMPSON, CARL D., *Is the Chautauqua a Free Platform?* New Republic, 41:524. Dec. 17, 1924.

The trials of a Chautauqua speaker who finds a menace to free speech in his experience of last summer, when he was prevented on several occasions from delivering a lecture on public ownership of "super-power." "Mother, home, and heaven" lectures cause less embarassment. R. H. W.

WHIPPLE, T. K., *The Tragedy of Eugene O'Neill.* The New Republic, 41:529.

A well-reasoned and well-written criticism. Amateurs who produce O'Neill may be interested in these charges: O'Neill's characters are meagre, sketchy, lacking in all-around characterization, and tending to break up into hysterical disintegration over which O'Neill has no control in creation. O'Neill's philosophy, that existence is fraught with the tragedy of spiritual frustration, is the philosophy and tragedy of his own life.

R. H. W.

ANON., *The Minister.* Century Magazine, 110:1. May, 1925.

Why does the minister preach so loudly? Why does he seem merely a phrase-maker? Why are his hebdomadal efforts so vapid and ineffectual? The author confirms some of our long cherished suspicions: the minister, in his attempts to be all things to all men, must inevitably sink to mediocrity in every phase of his calling, especially in thinking and preaching. In a word, the American "preacher" is over-worked, and his only salvation is to re-organize his church along business or social service lines. A curiously evolved but unusually logical article. R. H. W.

LANE, ABBY E., KINSEY, MAY H., MCNAMEE, JULIA, LARSON, ELSIE R., and SCOTT, CHARLOTTE., *Teaching Oral Composition in the Primary Grades.* The Elementary English Review. January, February, and March, 1925.

A series of papers by classroom teachers of the Carter School, Chicago, Illinois, presenting aims and methods, specimen assignments and recitations.

YOUNG, STARK, *Conversations with Duse.* Century Magazine, 110:1. May, 1925.

An account of an interview with the great actress. Some illuminating remarks by Duse on Ibsen, Italian dramatists, and acting.

NEWS AND NOTES

DRAMATIC SUMMARY

(The request in the June QUARTERLY JOURNAL for news of dramatic productions met with most gratifying responses, and we hope that the custom of devoting the November News and Notes to this purpose will prove both popular and valuable. Unfortunately, most of the items concern college productions, and high school activity is barely recorded at all. This may be because of the relative lack of dramatic activities in secondary schools, but we hope that the next dramatic summary will represent more secondary school work.)

ONE of the most interesting items of news in the dramatic world is the work being done by the Niagara Falls High School. The dramatic clubs there have organized a Children's Theatre, and have presented several plays for children at Saturday matinees, for very small admission charge. Among the plays presented have been "Six Who Pass While the Lentils Boil" (Walker), "The Three Wishes" (Williamson and Sarg), "Three Pills in a Bottle" (Field), "Two Plum Puddings" (Clements), "Muffins," and a special children's matinee of "Wappin' Wharf" (Brooks). The experiment so far has been highly successful, members of the College Club and of the Federation of Mothers' Clubs assisting in promoting the programs.

The dramatic activities at Cornell University have been so many and so varied that it is possible only to record them. Academic courses in Oral Interpretation, Play Production, Advanced Practice, and a Seminar in Dramatic Art, all offered by the Department of Public Speaking, and courses in Dramatic Structure, History of the Drama, Modern Drama, and Playwriting, offered in the English Department, added to courses in Design and Color Composition in the College of Fine Arts and Architecture, all help to increase interest in dramatic work on the Cornell campus.

There has just been opened at Cornell a new University Theatre, in the Willard Straight Memorial Hall. The theatre, which

seats 440, includes workshop and rehearsal rooms and was designed by Delano and Aldrich, architects of New York City, in consultation with Professor A. M. Drummond. The proscenium, forestage, and lighting arrangement contain striking and original features intended to facilitate period productions.

Among the outstanding productions of the Cornell Dramatic Club are included the first English performance of "The Zealous Guardian" (Cervantes), the first performance of "The Inn of Discontent" (Wilde), the second American production of "The House Into Which We Are Born" (Jacques Copeau), and a group of original Cornell plays. Other plays on the long list (Professor Drummond has produced either a bill of one-acts or a long play each week-end of the college year) include "The Storm"(Drinkwater), "Double Demon" (Herbert), "Cheezo" (Dunsany), "A Sunny Morning" (Quintero), "Where the Cross Is Made" (O'Neil), "Wappin' Wharf" (Brooks), "The Man Who Married a Dumb Wife" (France), "A Matter of Husbands" (Molnar), "Playboy of the Western World" (Synge), "Ricardo and Viola" (Beaumont and Fletcher), "Rain" (Burnett), "The Stronger" (Strindberg).

Additional plays produced during the 1925 season of the Cornell Summer Theatre include, with others: "The Inn of Discontent" (Wilde), "The Last Man Inn" (Maxwell), "The Dear Departed" (Houghton), "Riders to the Sea" (Synge), "Minuet" (Parker). Classes in Play Production produced "The Death of Tintagiles" (Maeterlinck), "Neighbors" (Gale), and "A Man Should Have a Wife" (Rauschenbusch).

Dramatic activities at Cornell have increased so remarkably that Professor Drummond has four graduate assistants in direction this year.

Dramatic productions at the University of Iowa during the past school year have included the following: "Children of the Moon" (Flavin), "Devil's Disciple" (Shaw), "Fashion" (Mowatt), "Beggar on Horseback" (Kaufman and Connelly), "Alice Sit-By-The-Fire" (Barrie), "Why Not?" Williams, "The Silver Box" (Galsworthy), "Midsummer Night's Dream" (Shakespearre), and three original one-act plays, "The Cameo" (Ray E. Holcombe), "A Lady of Destiny" (Phoebe Hoffman,

and "The House Can't Build the Barn" (Mary K. Reely).

Additional summer school performances were given of "The Goose Hangs High" (Beach), "R.U.R." (Capek), "Tickless Time" (Glaspell and Cook), as well as revivals of Euripides, "Iphigenia in Tauris" and Dekker's "Shoemakers' Holiday", and the first performance of "Trails" (Mary K. Reely).

Special courses in dramatics at Iowa include Theory and Technic of Acting, Dramatic Production, Stagecraft, Stage Design, The High School Play, Readings on the Development of the American Theatre, Tendencies of the Contemporary Stage, Advanced Dramatic Production, and Seminar in Dramatic Production.

Productions at the University of Minnesota during the past year were listed as follows: "Captain Applejack" (Hackett), "Kismet" (Knoblach), "You and I" (Barry), "The Ideal Husband" (Wilde), "The Intimate Strangers" (Tarkington), and "The Trojan Women" (Euripides).

Four plays were presented in the original one-act play contest of 1925, held annually at Minnesota by the 1911 Class Drama Fund, "Iron Gods" (Schjoll), "Jonathan and the Lovely Lie" (Elizabeth Hartzell), "Dear Mary's Mother" (Frank Johnson), and "The Skin Drum" (Anna Theis).

Summer school performances at Minnesota were: "The Dover Road" (Milne), "The Man Who Married a Dumb Wife" (France), "The Very Naked Boy" (Walker), "The Lady of the Weeping Willow Tree" (Walker), "Rosalie" (Maury), "Torches" (Raisbeck) and "The Trysting Place" (Tarkington).

Punchinello, the Dramatic Club of the College of Agriculture at Minnesota, presented "The Ghost Story" (Tarkington), "A Matter of Choice" (Tannewitz) and "A Fan and Two Candlesticks" (Macmillan).

Among the more interesting productions of the Western Normal Players at Kalamazoo, Michigan, were "Captain Applejack" (Hackett), "A Thousand Years Ago" (MacKaye), "The Man Who Married a Dumb Wife" (France), "It's Time Something Happened" (Doyle), and a Commencement performance of the play which won the prize in the one-act play contest held by the

Players, "Confining Wings", by W. Mulford Shaw, W. S. N. '26.

Reported by the University Players of Arizona are productions of "Why Marry?" (Williams), "Candida (Shaw), and "In Dixons' Kitchen" (Stout and Lay).

At Berea College, Kentucky, were given performances of "Come Out of the Kitchen" (Thomas), "Benedict Arnold" (Weir), "The Cardinal" (Parker), "Will o' the Wisp" (Halman), "The China Pig" (Emig), "The Trysting Place" (Tarkington), "The Flower of Yeddo" (Mapes), "Tickless Time" (Glaspell and Cook), and "X-O" (Drinkwater). Plays are given in "The Tabernacle", a rejuvenated barn, which has a seating capacity of twelve hundred.

Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa, reports the production of "Dulcy" (Kaufman and Connelly), "Icebound" (Davis), and three one-acts, "The China Guinea Pig" (Knox), "Trifles" (Glaspell), and "Suppressed Desires" (Glaspell and Cook).

At the Trenton, New Jersey, State Normal School, was presented the medieval comedy, "At the Sign of the Greedy Pig", and the Chinese pantomine, "Celestial Love", as well as a program of dramatized ballads.

Oswego State Normal presented, during the past year, "Suppressed Desires" (Cook and Glaspell), "Rollo's Wild Oats" (Kummer), and "The Knave of Hearts."

Bellingham, (Washington) State Normal School reports performances of "Icebound" (Davis), "The Show-off", and "Twelfth Night" (Shakespeare).

Plays produced by the Indianapolis Manual Training High School were: "A Little Journey" (Crothers) and "Kiss for Cinderella" (Barrie).

Dramatic activity at the State College of Washington during the past year included performances of "Mrs. Bumpstead Leigh",

"A Successful Calamity" (Kummer), "Only 38" (Thomas), "Ice-Bound" (Davis), "The Intimate Strangers" (Tarkington), "You Never Can Tell" (Shaw), and "What Every Woman Knows" (Barrie), besides over thirty one-act plays.

At Pennsylvania State College were given performances of "Kempy" (Nugents); the three one-act plays, "A Night at an Inn" (Dunsany), "Fourteen" (Gerstenberg), "Sweet and Twenty" (Dell); and three original one-act plays, written by students in the class in playwriting.

Dramatic performances at Louisiana State University were as follows: "Only 38" (Thomas), "Mr. Pym Passes By" (Milne), "Adam and Eva" (Bolton and Middleton), "Mrs. Pat and the Law" (Aldis), "Six Who Pass While the Lentile Boil" (Walker), and "Lima Beans" (Kreymborg).

At the West Virginia University, work in dramatics the first semester of last year was confined to a course in the One-Act Play, with several plays coached and presented by students in the course. Four plays were chosen for public performance one of which, "Riders to the Sea", was taken to the Cumnock Theatre Tournament at Evanston at Christmas time last year and there awarded first prize. A similar program was undertaken the second semester, the public performance being given at Commencement time. During the summer session "A Midsummer Night's Dream" (Shakespeare) was presented on the campus.

The leading performances of the past year at Iowa State College at Ames have been: "Icebound" (Davis), "Candida" (Shaw), "The Dover Road" (Milne), and a group of one-acts, including "The Dear Departed" (Houghton), "Two Crooks and a Lady" (Pillot), "Marriage Proposal" (Tchekoff), "Suppressed Desires" (Glaspell and Cook), "The Rector" (Crothers), "Thursday Evening" (Morley), "The Ghost Story" (Tarkington) and "The Valiant" (Middlemas and Hall).

The only public performance of the Dramatic Club at the University of Pennsylvania was "Dear Brutus" (Barrie).

Albion College, Michigan, has produced during the past year "Icebound" (Davis), "Candida" (Shaw), "The Goose Hangs High" (Beach), and a program of one-act plays.

Long plays presented by students of Tennessee College for Women, Murfreesboro, were "Quality Street" (Barrie), and "The Romancers" (Rostand).

Western Union College, LeMars, Iowa, has recently presented "The Lion and the Mouse," "The Arrival of Kitty," "$1200 a Year" (Ferber), and "As a Woman Thinketh." The college boasts of the only open air theatre in Iowa. The first shrubbery for it was set out two years ago by the Sophomore class. Roy M. Smith is director of the Speech Department at LeMars.

Among the many interesting productions at the University of Utah the past year were included: "Riders to the Sea" (Sygne), "Six Who Pass While the Lentils Boil" (Walker), "The Hour Glass" (Yeats), "Neighbors" (Gale), "Will o' the Wisp" (Halman), "Joint Owners in Spain" (Brown), "Mama's Affair" (Kummer), "The Boomerang" (Smith), "Mary the Third" (Crothers), "Pillars of Society" (Ibsen).

Slippery Rock Normal School presented "Adam and Eva" (Bolton and Middleton), "Nothing but the Truth", and "The Rivals" (Sheridan).

The Dramatic Club at Kirksville (Missouri) State Normal has toured the Missouri Little Theatre Circuit with "The Rock" (Hamlin), and "The Servant in the House" (Kennedy). During the summer "Comedy of Errors" (Shakespeare) was staged in the new John R. Kirk Auditorium.

Mask and Wig Players of the University of South Dakota presented "You and I" (Barry) early in the year.

The Green Door Dramatic Club, of Western Illinois Teachers College at Macomb, reports productions of "You and I" (Barry),

"Intimate Strangers" (Tarkington), "The Road to Yesterday" (Dix and Sutherland), "Just Suppose" (Thomas).

The new center of the Drama League of America at Macomb has held reading rehearsals of such plays as "Beggar on Horseback (Kaufman and Connelly), "Sun Up" (Vollmer), "St. Joan" (Shaw), "The Swan" (Molnar), "Outward Bound" (Davis), and "The Show Off." They report that such a plan "goes far toward the problem of participation in informal dramatic activities for the general student body."

NEWS OF THE DEPARTMENTS

At the April meeting of the Michigan Schoolmaster's Club, plans were completed for a state organization to be known as the Michigan Association of Teachers of Speech. Officers elected were: President, H. L. Ewbank, Albion College; Vice-President, F. B. McKay, State Normal College, Ypsilanti; Secretary-Treasurer, Miss Anne McGurk, Ann Arbor High School. Plans are under way whereby such Associations may be affiliated with the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH.

Tufts College is the fortunate recipient of a two hundred thousand dollar fund for work in oratory and debate, bequested by the will of the late Austin Fletcher of New York. Professor Newell C. Maynard has been named Fletcher Professor of Oratory in accordance with the terms of the will. So far as we know, this puts Tufts College at the head of the list financially.

The annual contest in declamation for the Vanderbilt Gold Medal, which has been held for twenty-three years at Vanderbilt University, has been discontinued.

News comes from Wabash that the privilege of allowing majors has been granted to the Speech department for the first time in the long history of that department. This is indicative of a general trend seen in both secondary and collegiate schools, and means the shifting of emphasis from intercollegiate competition to departmental work. With the granting of a major, a methods course has been added to the department's course of study.

A new department of Speech has been created at Missouri Wesleyan College, Cameron, Missouri, with B. W. Folsom in charge of the work. Professor Folsom spent the summer studying at the University of Wisconsin.

The teachers of Public Speaking in the State of Wyoming have organized the "Wyoming Association of Teachers of Public Speaking." Officers are: President, Miss Maurine Hollo, of Wheatland High School; Secretary, H. H. Higgins, University of Wyoming; and Treasurer, Miss Frances Ferris, of the Natrona County High School. The organization will publish a Bulletin three times a year, with the Secretary of the Association acting as Editor.

One of the most interesting publications to reach the NEWS AND NOTES Editor's desk is the "Speech Annual", a newspaper published by the students of the Department of Speech in the high school at Pontiac, Michigan, covering all the news concerning courses in Public Speaking, class news, plays, debates, stage-design, and editorials concerning the value of Speech work.

The University of Minnesota is adding several new courses to its Speech curriculum, all carrying graduate credit. These courses include Voice Science, Psychology of Speech, Advanced Speech Correction, Speech Composition, and Advanced Dramatic Production. Very soon the department expects to offer all the requirements for a Master's degree.

A slightly different turn to the informal method of conducting intercollegiate debates was tried at Cornell last spring, when Iowa State, Western Reserve and Cornell participated in a discussion of the Supreme Court question. Each school sent two speakers, one on each side of the proposition. The decision was by the audience on the merits of the question. The presence of speakers from three institutions proved to be of great interest to both speakers and audience.

The Tennessee Oratorical League, which has hitherto consisted of the University of Tennessee, Vanderbilt, University of the

South (Sewanee), Cumberland, University of Chattanooga, Maryville College and Southwestern Presbyterian University, will be expanded to include all colleges in the state which belong to the Tennessee College Association. There will be two contests, one in the eastern section and one in the western, before the final contest at Nashville for the Patten prize.

The regular debating schedule at Vanderbilt has been supplemented by what is called Extension debates. A debater from Vanderbilt meets a debater from some other college at one of the preparatory or high schools, and they debate a current question. Each speaker speaks three times and there are no judges and no decisions. Nearly forty such debates were added to the regular schedule at Vanderbilt last year and a slightly smaller number this year.

RADIO NEWS

The first radio interpretative reading contest was held at the State College of Washington, at Pullman, late in the spring. The winner was determined by vote of the listeners-in.

Kenneth L. Williams, of Berkeley, California, is delivering a series of six lectures through Station KGO, the General Electric Company, at Oakland. The topics are: (1) Achieving Leadership Through Effective Public Speaking; (2) How to Train and Develop the Voice; (3) How to Prepare a Speech; (4) The Mechanics of Public Speaking; (5) What Characterizes the Effective Speech, and (6) The Cultural Value of Public Speaking. The first lecture was given on September 7, as a feature of the California Diamond Jubilee Celebration, and was heard not only by listeners at a distance but by a crowd of 100,000 persons gathered about the giant amplifiers at the San Francisco Civic Center.

The public speaking department of New York University is coöperating with Station WJZ in the training of its announcers. In the matter of putting good diction and well modulated voices on the air the New York stations—some of them at least—appear to be doing excellent pioneer work.

So many intercollegiate debates are being broadcast now that such an event has ceased to be news. But tell us about them anyhow—or what have you?

PERSONALS

W. A. Cable, of the University of Iowa Speech faculty, taught Public Speaking the past summer at the Western Illinois State Teachers' College, at Macomb.

Wilbur Jones Kay, of West Virginia University, has returned after spending the summer in Europe with his family.

Claude Sifritt, of the University of Michigan and Ohio Wesleyan, is succeeding R. A. Tallcott at Butler College, Indianapolis.

Charles Templer, formerly professor of public speaking at Kansas Wesleyan University, is the new department head at Hamline University, St. Paul.

Mrs. Perry Thompson, who has been head of the Department of Expression at Illinois College at Jacksonville, has resigned her work and moved to Evanston with her husband.

H. H. Higgins has resigned his position at the University of Wyoming to accept a position in the Department of Public Speaking of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

Miss Laura Shaw has returned from a year's teaching in Japan, and has resumed her work at Western Normal College, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Miss Lousene Rouseau has resigned her position at Western State Normal College, and is spending this year doing research work at the Sorbonne University in Paris.

William Tannewitz has given up his position at the University of Wisconsin to accept a similar position at New York Unversity.

W. E. Gilman, formerly at the University of Missouri, has become instructor in public speaking at Cornell.

Miss Pearl Le Compte, of Western Illinois State Teachers' College, is devoting a year's leave of absence to graduate study in the Northwestern University School of Speech.

Ray Holcombe has left the Iowa State College at Ames to join the staff of the Department of Speech at the University of Iowa.

Mr. Leland Rose, of Wabash College, has joined the speech faculty at Oregon Agricultural College.

M. T. Herrick, who has been assistant director of the summer

theatre at Cornell, has accepted a position at Iowa State College, where he will have charge of the work in dramatics.

Hoyt H. Hudson, for the past two years at Swarthmore College, has gone to the University of Pittsburgh as Professor of English. With W. M. Parrish, he is conducting a seminar in rhetoric and public speaking.

Ross Scanlon, Cornell '25, has joined the staff at the University of Pittsburgh as instructor in Public Speaking.

Everett L. Hunt, of Cornell, is spending his sabbatical year teaching at Swarthmore College.

T. J. Pennington, formerly of the Shippensburg State Normal School, has joined the staff at the University of Pennsylvania.

DIRECTORY

ALABAMA

Birmingham—Johnson, Rose B., 2216 Arlington Avenue.
St. Bernard—Taylor, Rev. Germain, St. Bernard College.

ARIZONA

Flagstaff—Dewey, Martha E., Northern Arizona Normal School.
Tucson—Cable, W. Arthur, 1248 E. Fifth Street.

ARKANSAS

CALIFORNIA

Alhambra—Yelland, George L. Board of Education.
Berkeley—Howell, Rebecca R., 2820 Webster Street.
McLean, Fannie W., 1829 Bancroft Way.
Perstein, Arnold, 462 Wheeler Hall, University of California.
Rowell, Edward Z., 1055 Miller Avenue.
Sesnon, Father Robert, 2401 Fulton Street.
Watkins, Dwight, Box 54 Wheeler Hall, University of California.
Whitehead, George S., Room 462 Wheeler Hall, University of California.
Williams, Kenneth L., 1912 Monterey Avenue.
Chula Vista—Lane, F. H., 637 Third Avenue.
Glendale—Labadie, Evelyn M. S. Emerson School of Self Expression, 730-32 South Glendale.
Long Beach—Ellis, Ruth H., 148 American Avenue.
Nattkemper, L. G., 414 East 17th Street.
Rackham, Henrietta, 920 New York Street, Apartment 3.
Los Angeles—Fink, Mrs. Georgia S., 1436 South Hobart Boulevard.
Graham, Mrs. Gladys Murphy, 855 North Vermont Street, University of California, Southern Branch.
Immel, Ray K., University of Southern California.
Lawton, Mrs. Marie, 4509 Fifth Avenue.
Sturgis, Granville, 8224 De Longpre Avenue.
Mountain View—Simpson, Winea.
Oakland—Miller, Mrs. Fanny Ward, Fanny Ward Miller School of Expression, 290 Grand Avenue.
Pasadena—Keppie, Elizabeth E., 1641 Paloma Street.
Reeder, Nell, 449 North Madison Avenue, Williams School for Handicapped Children.
Pomona—Judson, Helen I., 878 Kingsley Avenue.
Red Bluff—Jarvis, Gail, 435 Crittenden Street.
Redlands—Dennis, W. C., University of Redlands.
Reedley—Evans, Ella A. Reedley, Junior High School.
Sacramento—Dale, John F., Principal High School, 34th and Y Streets.
San Diego—Hammon, Professor Wilbur A., 2408 El Capitan Avenue.
San Francisco—Berg, Beda, 132 Elsie Street.
Santa Rosa—Fields, Catherine L., 740 Mendocino Avenue.
Stanford University—Bassett, Lee Emerson, Leland Stanford Junior University, P. O. Box U.
Buckingham, Elizabeth Lee, Department of English, Leland Stanford Junior University, Box 102.
Davis, William H., Food Research Institute.
Emerson, James G., Leland Stanford Junior University.

COLORADO

Boulder—Ramsdell, Edward T., University of Colorado.
Denver—Bluemel, Dr. C. S., 1401 Race Street.
Daly, Bernadetta M., 1357 Kalamath Street.

Garrett, Pauline, (East High School), 1720 High Street.
Kingsley, Mrs. Perle Shale, 2056 South York Street.
Kumler, Mary E., 2111 South Clayton Avenue, University of Denver.
Marrs, Emily, 1570 Detroit Street.
Willsea, Mary, 3332 Meade Street.
La Junta—Hunter, Mrs. Aubrey, 517 Colorado Avenue.
Manitou—Hampshire, Rowena K.
Pueblo—Keightley, Annie K., 513 Broadway.

CONNECTICUT

Milford—Myers, May E., Lauralton Hall.
Southington—Marsland, Cora, Lewis High School.
Westhaven—Stiles, Edgar C., Superintendent Union School.

DELAWARE

Wilmington—Sharp, Sallie, 303 West 21st Street, Sallie Sharp School of Expression.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Chevy Chase—Pierce, Mrs. Bess Baker, 3926 Military Road.
Washington—Hedrick, Jennie, 3321 "N" Street, Director of Speech Clinic.

FLORIDA

DeLand—Stover, Irving C., 201 Minnesota Avenue.
Jacksonville—Griner, Charles B., Hotal Seminole.
Langley, E. D., Young Men's Christian Association, Laura and Duval Streets.

GEORGIA

Norman Park—Norris, Florence E., Normal Institute.

IDAHO

Caldwell—Hayman, H. H.

ILLINOIS

Altamont—Hertzell, Clara.
Bloomington—Fiderlick, James J., Illinois Wesleyan University.
Chicago—Blood, Mary A., 3358 South Michigan Avenue, Columbia College of Expression.
Carnes, Mrs. L. C., 642 Bittersweet, Chicago Place.
Dwyer, Martha H., 425 Surf Street.
Edwards, Davis, University of Chicago, 5707 Kimbark Avenue.
Gorelick, Mrs. Elizabeth, 1223 North California Avenue.
Kenyon, Dr. Elmer L., 104 South Michigan Avenue.
Ketcham, Alice S., 11009 Esmond Street.
Margolis, Beulah, 705 Milwaukee Avenue.
Miner, Maud A., 718 Fine Arts Building.
Nelson, Professor B. G., 5714 Dorchester Avenue.
Schmidt, Austin G., 1076 West Roosevelt Road.
Sherbahn, Helen J., 4918 Kenmore Avenue.
Wyrick, Martha, 4425 Greenwood Avenue.
Christopher—Hiser, Nova O., Box 102, Community High School.
Decatur—Fike, Louise, Decatur High School.
Thompson, Mrs. Beulah B., 467 West Main Street.
Young, William E., James Millikin University.
Elgin—Barker, Juliet, Elgin High School, 14 South Chapel Street.
Evanston—Bowman, Carl, 1724 Chicago Avenue.
Dennis, Ralph B., Director Northwestern University School of Speech.
Fry, Dorothea, 811 Clinton Place.
Gaylord, Joseph S., 502 See Street.
Herring, Mrs. Bertha F., 1008 Huiman Street.
Kerr, Evelyn, 2001 Orrington Avenue.
Lardner, J. L., 810 Milburn Street, Northwestern University.
Mack, Eula, 2001 Orrington Avenue.
Phelps, Manley, School of Speech, Northwestern University.
Sarett, Lew R., 201 Ridge Avenue.
Simon, Clarence T., School of Speech, Northwestern University.
Smith, Pearle Aikin, School of Speech, Northwestern University.

Swift, Mrs. Ethel Rogers, 2110 Sherman Avenue.
Galesburg—Barrer, Fern, 737 North Broad Street.
Menser, Clarence L., Knox College.
Roadstrum, Dorothy, 430 East Soser Street.
Shaw, Warren, 715 North Broad.
Sheets, Roberta D., Lombard College.
Harrisburg—Morrell, Essie A., 100 East Walnut Street.
Jacksonville— Huss, Olive G.
Thompson, Mrs. Perry C., 1124 West College Avenue.
Lake Forest—Leverton, Garrett H., Lake Forest College.
Lisle—Shonka, A. F., Procopius College.
Minonk—Wiltz, Lucille M.
Monmouth—McGrew, D. R., 141 South Ninth Street, Monmouth College.
Mount Carroll—Berkstresser, Katherine E., Francis Shimer School.
Mount Olive—Peck, Ruth Scott.
Naperville—Oliver, Professor Guy E., 68 Benton Avenue, North Western College.
Pontiac—Mouser, Mary L., 316 East Howard Street.
River Forest—Sister Marie Aileen, Rosary College.
Robinson—Berry, (Miss) Franc, 607 West Walnut Street.
Rock Island—Pearce, Iva C., Augustana College.
Rockford—Perego, Ina, Rockford H. S.
Urbana—Hamilton, Mrs. H. H., 203 Michigan Avenue.
Woolbert, Charles H., 605 Washington Boulevard, University of Illinois.
Waukegan—Dunn, Bernice, Clayton Hotel.
McNaughton, Mrs. Geneva P., Waukegan Township High School.
Wheaton—Ludgate, Jane S., 605 Ohio Street.
Winnetka—Phillips, Arthur E., 451 East Hill Road.

INDIANA

Bloomington—Karr, Harrison M., Indiana University.
Clinton—Livingstone, Marian, 405 South Fifth Street.
Crawfordsville—Brigance, W. N., Wabash College.
Evansville—Joslin, Rose B., 623 Second Street.
Greencastle—Gough, H. B., 1009 South College Avenue.
Williams, Robert E., 628 East Washington Street.
Yeager, Beulah, 643 East Seminary.
Indianapolis—Hasseld, Bertha, 220 North Temple Avenue.
Perkins, Lola I., Manual Training High School.
Sifritt, Claude, Butler College.
Weimar, Leora, 4021 South State Street.
Lafayette—Scott, Preston H., Purdue University.
Lebanon—Kerlin, Kathleen E., 409 Lebanon Street.
Muncie—Pavey, Mary C., Indiana State Normal School, 311 North College Avenue.
Ramsey, Mrs. May L., 720 West North Street.
Notre Dame—Mooney, E. Vincent, University of Notre Dame.
Richmond—Trueblood, E. P., Earlham College.
St. Marys-of-the-Woods — Cryan, Mary, St. Marys-of-the-Woods.
Laughlin, Agnes C., St. Marys-of-the-Woods.
South Bend—Trich, Agnes, Morningside Club, 413 West Colfax Street.
Upland—Pogue, Barton Rees.
Winamac—Hoover, Marcella.

IOWA

Ames—Bauer, Marvin G., Station Z, Box 23.
Fritz, Charles A., Iowa State College.
Herrick, Marvin T., Box 181, Station A.
Howell, Wilbur S., Iowa State College.
Roth, Alpha, Station A, Box 436, Iowa State College.
Shattuck, Fredrica V., Iowa State College.
Wagner, Russell H., Iowa State College.
Cedar Rapids—Chapin, Florence Sinclair, 2306 Upland Drive.
Des Moines—Hansen, Pearl, 2225 Grand Avenue.

Van Tuyl, Mrs. Helen M., 4606 Boulevard Place.
Dubuque—Welch, Dale D., University of Dubuque.
Fairfield—Hill, Evelyn, Parsons College.
Fayette—Collett, Margaret Jane, Upper Iowa University.
Grinnell—Ryan, J. P., Grinnell College.
Iowa City—Baird, A. Craig, University of Iowa.
Barnes, H. G., Iowa City High School.
Gray, Giles W., 12 Liberal Arts Building, 609 Summit Street.
Jackson, W. J., 201-C Natural Science Building, University of Iowa.
Mabie, Edward, Room 10, Liberal Arts Building, University of Iowa.
Mills, Mrs. Alice W. MacLeod, University of Iowa.
Trumbauer, W. H., 611 North Johnson Street.
Weller, Herbert C., University of Iowa.
Kalona—McAninch, Mrs. Ethel O., R. R. No. 4.
Lamoni—Roberts, Forest A., Graceland College.
Le Mars—Smith, Roy M., 501 Second Avenue, S. E.
Marshalltown—Gallagher, Carolyn F.
Mt. Vernon—Baker, Rose Joslin, Cornell College.
New Sharon—Else, Dorothy.
Onawa—Gierman, Hulda, Box 496.
Onslow—Paul, Vera A.
Oskaloosa—Haworth, Donald, Penn College, 429 North Third Street.
Stanley—Heller, Faith.

KANSAS

Baldwin City—Larry, Etta, Baker University, Box 273.
Leach, A. E., Baker University, Box 224.
Coffeyville—Ferguson, Jewel, 605 West Sixth Street.
Emporia—Crissey, Catherine Y., 814 Market Street.
Pflaum, George R. R., 1101 Congress Street.
Ft. Leavenworth—Van Schaick, Colonel Louis J.
Hutchinson—O'Connell, William V., 22 East 14th Street.
Kansas City—Morgan, Howard C., 808 North 17th Street.
Youmans, R. O., Kansas City University.
Linsborg—Swensson, Annie Ther, 343 North College Street.
Wahlin, Vendla.
Manhattan—Hill, Howard T., Kansas State Agricultural College, Box 1.
Saffordville—Jones, Martha Pearl, Box 24.
Salina—Templer, Charles S., 851 Highland Street.
Topeka—Buehler, E. C., Washburn College.
Wichita—Wilner, George D., Fairmount College.

KENTUCKY

Berea—Raine, James W.
Georgetown—Fisher, G. E., Georgetown College.

LOUISIANA

Baton Rouge—Adams, J. Q., 542 St. Francis Street.
New Orleans—Hanley, Ben, 2018 Prytania Street.
Oliveira, Amy, 2300 Joseph Street.

MAINE

Portland—Merry, Glenn N., 41 Beacon Street.

MARYLAND

Baltimore—Smith, Bromley, 3021 Huntingdon Avenue.
Williamsport—Steffey, Mary Erwin.

MASSCACHUSETTS

Belmont—Robbins, Samuel D., 40 Centre Avenue.
Boston—Dacey, Theresa, Assistant in Charge Speech Improvement classes, Boston Public Schools.
Gunnison, Binney, 301 Pierce Building.
Swift, W. B., Director, Normal School for Speech Education, 110 Bay State Road.
Tripp, W. B., 25 Huntington Avenue.
Brookline—Rice, Phidelah, 286 Clark Road.

Cambridge—Winter, I. L., 32 Hubbard Park.
Northhampton—Avery, Elizabeth, 150 Elm Street.
South Hadley—Ball, Margaret, Faculty House, Mt. Holyoke College.
Couch, Isadell C., Mt. Holyoke College.
Stinchfield, Sara M., 1 Bridgems Lane.
Watertown—Fladeland, Sina, Perkins Institution.
Wellesley—Damon, Mrs. Ruth A., Cazenove Hall, Wellesley College.
Hunt, Mrs. Elizabeth, Stone Hall, Wellesley College.
Moses, Edith W., Wellesley College.

MICHIGAN

Albion—Ewbank, H. L., Albion College.
Starr, Cynthia V., Albion College.
Swisher, Florence E., Albion College.
Allegan—Edwards, Lydia M.
Ann Arbor—Brandt, Carl, 500 South Fifth Avenue.
Crocker, Lionel, 503 Cherry Street.
Densmore, G. E., University of Michigan.
Eich, Louis, 820 Granger Avenue.
Fleischman, Earl E., University of Michigan.
Hollister, R. D. T., 1306 Wells Street.
Trueblood, Thomas C., 1024 Hill Street.
Battle Creek—Hathaway, John H., 338 West Van Buren Street.
Bronson—Davidson, Sybil, 512 East Chicago Street.
Detroit—Allan, Helen A., 4443 Oregon Avenue.
Gibbs, Ruth, 519 Kenilworth Avenue.
Littell, Winifred H., 677 West Alexandrine.
Stoddard, Clara B., 3779 Maybury Grand Avenue.
Dowagiac—Heemstra, Simon, 407 Spruce Street.
Ecorse—Winn, Margaret H., School No. 3.
Grand Haven—Nisbett, Joan, 912 Sheldon Road.
Grand Rapids—Ball, Miss F. D., Central High School Library.
Baxter, Howard F., 747 Fountain Street N. E.
Easterbrook, Eudora, Directing Teacher of Speech, Strong Junior High School.
Everest, C. A., Union High School.
Hastings—Murphy, H. Maurice, 109 South Washington Street.
Highland Park—Stearns, Virginia, 121 Highland Avenue.
Holland—Nykerk, J. B., Hope College.
Ionia—Reynolds, Flora, 520 North Jefferson Street.
Ironwood—Sister Mary Edith, Ayer Street.
Kalamazoo—Lahman, Carroll P., Western State Normal School.
Lindblom, Anna, Western State Normal School.
Rousseau, Lousene, Western State Normal School.
Shaw, Laura V., 430 West Lovell Street.
Weiss, N. J., 529 South Park Street.
Mt. Clemens—Lockwood, Olive E., Mt. Clemens High School.
Mt. Pleasant—Rank, Marjorie Joan, 317 North Fancher Avenue.
Plymouth—Huston, Ruth E., 923 Penniman Avenue.
Pontiac—Viola, William N., 15 Edison Street.
Rogers City—Young, Mrs. M. L.
Royal Oak—Moore, Eva A., 700 South Washington Street.
Saginaw—Miller, Harry G., 630 South Weadock.
Sandusky—Snyder, Paul H.
Three Rivers—Lull, Emerson.
Ypsilanti—Lathers, J. Stuart, 711 Cross Street.
McKay, F. B., 1116 Washtenaw Avenue.
Stowe, Marion F., 212 North Hamilton Street.

MINNESOTA

Duluth—Trolander, E. Evangeline, 722 East First Street.
Faribault—Kildow, Florence M., 18 West Sixth Street.
Hibbing—Dumke, Emma Charlotte, Junior College.
Le Sueur Center—Vickers, Lucile F.
Mankato—Farr, Alice N., State Teachers' College.

Minneapolis—Garns, John S., 1128 La Salle Avenue.
Green, Ruth E., Director of Speech Correction Public Schools, Curtis Hotel.
Morse, W. L., 310 Folwell Hall, University of Minnesota.
Rarig, F. M., University of Minnesota.
Seering, Harold A., Department of English, University of Minnesota.
Smith, Alethea, University of Minnesota.
Sveeggen, P. A., 915 26th Avenue, South.
Northfield—Cochran, I. M., Carleton College.
Kentzler, Ruth P., Carleton College.
Menchhofer, Jos. D., St. Olaf College.
Pine City—Norton, Ruth G.
St. Paul—Morton, Marguerite W., 824 Holly Avenue.
Virginia—Lemstrom, Ammy, 514 South 7th Street.
Winona—Davis, Susan B., Winona State Teachers College.

MISSISSIPPI

Clarksdale—Rose, Nettie, 423 Cherry Street.
Hattiesburg—Gay, J. C., Box 3.

MISSOURI

Columbia—Hulbert, George W., University of Missouri.
Fayette—Morrison, Ira G., 501 West Spring Street.
Kansas City—Drake, Herbert L., Manual Training High School.
Kirksville—Cornwell, Cliff, State Teachers College.
Wise, C. M., 507 South Davis Street.
Kirkwood—Mendham, Nelly E., 220 Way Avenue.
Springfield—Tetrick, James W.
St. Louis—Battle, Anita T., 5656 Kingsbury Boulevard.
Dix, Pearl, 4558 Red Bud Avenue.
Forsythe, Irene A., 7522 Forsythe Boulevard.
Grace, Charity, Roosevelt High School.
Gregory, Olivia, 3202 Palm Street.
McGinnis, Mildred, 818 South Kingshighway.
Wall, Mrs. Otta Augustus Jr., 321 Belt Avenue, Apartment 1.

MONTANA

Great Falls—Martin, Thora L., 1104 Sixth Avenue, North.
Livingston—Weston, Nellie C., Box 373.
Missoula—Norvelle, L. R., State University of Montana.

NEBRASKA

Beatrice—Brown, Mary Naylor, 901 Lincoln Street.
Kearney—Morris, Ruby E., 520 West 22nd Street.
Lincoln—Pound, Louise, 1632 L. Street.
Omaha—Harrington, Mrs. A. H., 1034 38th Avenue.
Liljegren, Alice, Supervisor of Speech Correction, City Hall.
Puls, Edwin, Professor of Speech, Creighton University.

NEVADA

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Brookline—Woolson, Clara B.
Hanover—Brown, Frank E., Dartmouth College.
Utterback, William E., Dept. of Public Speaking, Dartmouth College.
Winans, J. A., Dartmouth College.

NEW JERSEY

Bayonne—Brown, Marguerite L., 38 East 37th Street.
Bordentown—Landon, Thomas D., Bordentown Military Institute.
Camden—Kieth, Alice, Education Department, Victor Talking Machine Company.
Hightstown—Reeves, J. Walter, Peddie Institute.
Jersey City—Creasey, Hannah M., 2600 Boulevard.
Long Branch—Raymond, Mildred M., 168 Garfield Avenue.
Newark—Hawkins, Bertha J., 24 Pennington Street.
Thomas, Ruth H., 50 Second Avenue, Columbus Court.
New Brunswick—Edmunds, Marian, New Jersey College for Women.

Princeton—Smith, Henry W., 16 Dickinson Street.

Trenton—Kuhn, Effie Georgina, New Jersey State Normal School.

NEW MEXICO

NEW YORK

Batavia—Fowler, Christine C., 311 Washington Avenue.

Brooklyn—Barber, Sara H., 1208 Pacific Street.
Peyser, Theresa, 973 East 12th Street.
Prusslin, Isabelle, 253 Marey Avenue.
Smith, Eugene, 120 St. Marks Avenue.
Smith, W. Palmer, 401 East 18th Street.

Buffalo—Townsend, Gertrude, 1869 Seneca Street.

Canton—Miles, Edson R., 49 Park Street, St. Lawrence Library.

Corning—Meredith, Laura M., 145 Walnut Street.

Cortland—Lewis, F. LaMont, Central High School.

Elmira—Callahan, Florence, 109 Franklin Street.
Morrow, Geraldine, Elmira College.

Ithaca—Caplan, Harry, 25 Goldwin Smith Hall, Cornell University.
Drummond, Alexander, 114 Summit Avenue, Cornell University.
Hannah, Robert, 213 Bryant Avenue.
Hultzen, Lee S., 241 Linden Avenue.
Hunt, Everett Lee, 131 Kline Road, Cornell University.
Muchmore, G. B., Cayuga Heights Road.
Tallcott, Rollo Anson, 102 DeWitt Park.
Thomas, C. K., Cornell University,, 126 Catherine Street.
Wichelns, H. A., Goldwin Smith Hall.

Long Island—Tressler, J. C., 115 Pembroke Place, Kew Gardens.
Mack, Edith Madeline, 176 Grand Avenue, Rockville Centre.

Mamaroneck—Nolan, Anna, 7 Monroe Avenue.

New York—Alviene, C. M., The Alviene Schools, 43 West 72nd Street.
Bridge, William H., Hunter College of the City of New York, Park Avenue and 68th Street.
Cramer, Mary E., 403 West 119th Street.
Cusock, Annette Lucille, 2414 University Avenue.
Daggett, Windsor P., 202 West 74th Street.
Healey, J. T., College of the City of New York, Amsterdam Avenue and 136th Street.
Hughes, Nelly W., 130 West 57th Street.
Kane, E. A., 445 West 153rd Street.
Loeb, Elizabeth Vera, 51 West 81st Street.
McDowell, Mrs. Elizabeth Dickinson, 155 West 188th Street.
Mohr, Albert G., 2903 Valentine Avenue.
Morris, J. S., New York University, Washington Square.
Mulligan, Arthur G., 1707 University Avenue.
Perkins, Dagmar, 215 West 92nd Street.
Prentiss, Henrietta, Hunter College, Park Avenue and 68th Street.
Redmond, D. W., College of the City of New York, 140th Street and Connent Avenue.
Reeid, N. E., Longmans, Green and Co.
Robinson, Walter, 709 Carnegie Hall.
Schamus, John B., 2430 Morris Avenue.
Scripture, Mrs. Edward W., 20 Fifth Avenue.
Wells, Emilie J., 143 East 37th Street.
Wolter, Anne, 134 Carnegie Hall.

Ogdensburg—Nelson, Mabel A., Free Academy.

Poughkeepsie—Cochran, Mary B., Vassar College.
Stephens, Lucile, 14 Gray Street.
Taylor, Jane, Vassar College.

Rochester—Scott, Edith A., Department Public Instruction, Municipal Building.

Southampton—Schwenk, Dorothy G.

Syracuse—Bull, Grace S., School of Oratory, Syracuse University.

Montague, Bessie F., 813 South West Street.
Tilroe, H. M., Syracuse University.
Yonkers—Hartley, Alice C., Morris High School.
Staten Island—Williamson, A. B., 744 Castleton Avenue, West Brighton.
Tarrytown—Burghoff, Doris, Washington Irving High School.
Warner—Kennedy, S. L. (Onondaga Co.)

NORTH CAROLINA

Chapel Hill—McKie, George, University of North Carolina, Durham Road.
Olsen, William, University of North Carolina.
High Point—Owens, Henry Grady, 316 Morris, P. O. Box 5.
Raleigh—Cunningham, C. C., North Carolina State College.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ellendale—Redfield, Alice A., State Normal and Industrial School.
Grand Forks—Schonberger, E. D., University of North Dakota, University Station.

OHIO

Akron—McEbright, Carita, 396 East Market Street.
Parshall, Inez, 50 South Adolph Avenue.
Martin, Elva, 802 Castalia Street.
Welsh, Maude.
Cincinnati—Aldrich, Laura E., 3414 Burch Avenue, Hyde Park.
Cairns, Hazle T., 5673 Overlook Place, College Hill.
Nash, Texora, Texora Nash School of Expression, Hotel Alms Annex.
Van Wye, B. C., University of Cincinnati.
Cleveland—Throne, Mildred I., College for Women, Western Reserve University.
Wasserman, D. H., 8912 Yale Avenue.
Woodward, Howard S., Western Reserve University.
Cleves—Watson, Pansy.
Columbus—Ketcham, V. A., 199 Webber Road.
Sanford, W. P., 151 Crestview Road, Ohio State University.
Wiley, Earl W., 144 Clinton Heights Avenue.
Coshocton—Young, Margery, 1123 Adams Street.
Crestline—Fisher, Verona F., 608 North Thoman Street.
Delaware—Alcott, Mildred, 206 North Franklin Street.
Hunter, R. C., 287 North Washington Street.
Leas, Mrs. Pearl M., 136 West Winter Street.
Delaware—Marshman, Professor J. T., 11 Oak Hill.
McNabb, L. C., 279 South Sandusky Street, Ohio Wesleyan University.
Miller, Emerson W., 35 Van Deman Street, Ohio Wesleyan University.
Lorain—Hardy, Ruth M., Lorain High School.
Mingo Junction—Graham, C. B.
Mt. Vernon—Ringwalt, Ralph Curtis.
New Concord—Layton, Chas. R., Muskingum College.
Oberlin—Harbison, C. C., 42 South Cedar Street, Oberlin College.
Oxford—Flemming, Edwin G., Miami University.
Higgins, H. H., Miami University.
Struthers—Stewart, John B., 253 Bridge Street.
Wooster—Brillhart, Alta M., 216 West Henry Street.
Lean, D. G., Wooster College.

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma City—Flanary, I. D., Box 392.
Shawnee—Hopkins, A. A., Oklahoma Baptist University.
Tonkawa—Chauncey, F. May, University Prep. School.

OREGON

Corvallis—Barnes, Elizabeth M., Oregon State College.
Mallory, Louis, Oregon State College.
Ross, Leland M., Oregon State College.
Wells, Earl W., Oregon State College.
Monmouth—Goehring, Bernice R., Oregon State Normal.

Salem—Rahskopf, Horace G., Willamette University.

PENNSYLVANIA

Abington—Wyatt, Mrs. Zaidee Garr, Abington High School.
Beaver—Klingbeil, H. C., 294 East Second Street.
Bellevue—Howe, Elizabeth P., 21 South Euclid Avenue.
Bethlehem—Luch, Myron J., 737 Seventh Avenue.
Bloomsburg — Johnston, Alice, Bloomsburg State Normal.
Bryn Mawr—King, Samuel Arthur, Cartref Cottage.
Nichols, Tirzah L., Elliott and Lancaster Streets.
Bucks—Landon, Nadia, George School.
Butler—Wiggins, Marian H., 156 Oak Street.
Charleroi—Anderson, Grace, 927 Crest Avenue.
Chester—Doyle, Martha W., 305 East 22nd Street.
Connellsville—Hickman, Elton, 511 South Pittsburgh Street.
Easton—Illingworth, Robert S., Lafayette College.
Erie—Dunn, K. Ruth, 611 Reed Street.
Indiana—Sprowls, Edna Lee, Pennsylvania State Normal School.
Kane—More, Nettie A., 229 Welsh Street.
Mansfield—Allardice, Agnes I.
Meadville—Spalding, Alice Huntington, Allegheny College.
Philadelphia—Baxter, Frank C., University of Pennsylvania.
Davis, Serena Foley, Supervisor Speech Improvement Work, 1636 North 5th Street.
Dolman, John Jr., University of Pennsylvania.
Pennington, T. J., University of Pennsylvania.
James, Reese, University of Pennsylvania.
Stine, Harold S., University of Pennsylvania.
Pittsburgh—Hudson, Hoyt H., 213 Alumni Hall, University of Pittsburgh.
Parrish, W. M., University of Pittsburgh.
Reading—Barber, Gertrude E., 812 Walnut Street.
Washington—Marino, Teresina, 292 East Maiden Street.
West Chester—Caldwell, Florence M., Darlington Seminary.
Westtown—Baily, Albert L. Jr., Westtown School.
Wilkinsburg—Bell, Alice V., 735 South Avenue.

RHODE ISLAND

SOUTH CAROLINA

Greenville—Buist, Mrs. Idda Robbins, 414 Pendleton Street.
Spartansburg—Powers, Helene, 650 Mountain View Street.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Aberdeen—Root, A. R., Northern Normal and Industrial School.
Mitchell—Lambertson, F. W., Dakota Wesleyan University.
Sioux Falls—Dougherty, Ray E., Boyce-Greeley Building.
Drake, Florence M., Sioux Falls College.
Yankton—Lund, Thyra.

TENNESSEE

Jackson—Saunders, Mary Evans, Department Expression and Dramatic Art, Union University.
Memphis—Gill, Ella, 1242 Court Avenue.
Schloss, Florence, 572 Poplar Avenue.
Murfreesboro—Chapman, Mrs. Gage.
Strain, Mary A., Tennessee College for Women.
Nashville—Cockrill, Mary Harris.
Harris, Albert M., Wesley Hall, Vanderbilt University.

TEXAS

Austin—Griscom, Ellwood, Jr., University of Texas, 706 West 32nd Street.
Moore, William O., Department of Speech, University of Texas, 2711 Nueces Street.
Schofield, Rebecca Young, 1913 Rio Grande Street.
Canyon—Bryan, Earl C., West Texas State Teachers College.
Georgetown—Wentz, W. Dwight, 1403 Elm Street.
Kingsville—Francis, W. A.
San Antonio—Abbott, Frederick, 420 Martin Street.
Dickey, Miss Jeston, 327 Buckingham Avenue.
Will, Marjorie E., 309 Army Boulevard.

Vernon—Pendleton, Annah Joe, Box 792.
Waco—Lomrey, Sara, 1711 South 10th Street, Baylor University.
Waxahachie—Baumgartner, Ira P., Trinity College.
Fugate, Mrs. Harry, Box 612.

UTAH

American Fork—Beck, Reva Z.
Fountain Green—Nielson, Ivy.
Saint George—Pulsifer, Juanita.
Salt Lake City—Babcock, Maud May, University of Utah.
Caldwell, Margaret.
Higgs, Aliceile, 647 E. Fifth South.

VERMONT

VIRGINIA

Hampton—Taylor, Harriet Shotwell, Hampton Institute.
University—Paul, C. W., University of Virginia.

WASHINGTON

Pullman—Daggy, Maynard Lee, Washington State College.
Seattle—Grindrod, Ione, 1315 East 47th Street.
Rector, L. E., 4432 Brier Hill.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charleston—Gleissner, Lillian, Senior High School, 1524 Lee Street.
Fairmont—Opp, Paul F., Fairmont State Normal School.
Morgantown—Kay, Wilbur Jones, 519 Park Street.

WISCONSIN

Beloit—Jones, Nellie E., 722½ Park Avenue.
Rassweiler, G. F., Beloit College.
Deerfield—Wirth, Hazel.
Eau Claire—Thomson, C. L., State Normal School.
Green Bay—Leavitt, Florence J., West High School.
Kenosha—Pobe, Mrs. C. A., Kemper Hall, 417 Market Street.
Kohler, Smith L. L.
La Crosse—Dyson, Helen C., 225 South Seventh Street.
Madison—Barnes, John, 129 Lathrop Street, Bascorn Hall.
Borchers, Gladys, 124 North Orchard Street.
Holmes, F. Lincoln D., 14 South Mills Street.
Johnson, Gertrude E., 2020 Kendall Avenue.
McCarthy, Margaret, University of Wisconsin.
McGrew, J. Fred, Department of Speech, University of Wisconsin.
O'Neill, J. Milton, 2310 Monroe Street, University of Wisconsin.
Scott, Miss Almere, Extension Department, University of Wisconsin.
Skinner, E. Ray, 1116 Bowen Street.
Tannewatz, William J., University of Wisconsin, 110 North 6th Street.
Weaver, A. T., 1911 Keyes Avenue.
Welty, Lucile M., 2321 Rugby Row.
West, Robert, Department of Speech, University of Wisconsin.
Milwaukee—Duffey, William R., Marquette University.
Maule, Howard W., 520 49th Street.
Mills, Katherine J., North Division High School.
Racine—McDermott, Rev. W. P., St. Katherine's High School.
Rib Lake—Kuenne, Alma.
Ripon—Boody, Henry P., Ripon College.
Toussaint, Sylvester R., Ripon College.
Sheboygan—Lorenz, Jennie, 1630 North Eighth Street.
Waukesha—Rankin, May W., 303 East Avenue.

WYOMING

Sheridan—Van Boskirk, Frances, Box 234.
Torrington—Crowe, Ida M.

CANADA

Sask.—Saskatoon—Downer, C. W., B. A., Librarian, Normal School.
Toronto—Padwick, Catherine, 89 Craighurst.

HAWAII

Honolulu—Appleby, Una, Oahu College.

ENGLAND

London, N. 15—Smith, Joseph F., 152 High Road, South Tottenham.

SCOTLAND

Aberdeen—Mursell, Walter, 142 Hamilton Place.

NORWAY

Kristiania—Grenness, Konsulent Otto, Victoria Terasse 9 III.